

J. Buchanan Aberdeen } Geo: Forbes

VINDICATION

OF THE

Church
Fundamental Charter

O F

PRESBYTERY,

FROM

The EXCEPTIONS of the COUNTRY-MAN,
In his Letter to a Curate.

Wherein these QUERIES are considered;

- I. Whether it was the constant and uniform Practice of our Reformers, to join in the Communion of the Church of *England*, when they had Occasion?
- II. Whether our Reformers, in their *Public Deeds*, openly and solemnly professed, That they were of One Communion with the Church of *England*?
- III. Whether the *English* Liturgy was used in *Scotland*, for several Years, by our Reformers?

By a true Son of the afflicted Church of Scotland.

I cannot but judge, that either much Ignorance, or much Malice it is, that makes any traduce the English Common-Prayer Book, as if it were the Popish Mass Book, or as bad as it: And to deter Men from joining with those Prayers and Services therein, which are good, as if it were joining with Antichrist the Pope, (when they can hardly be ignorant, that the Martyrs, in Queen Mary's Days, were burnt for it) is impudent Falshood. Mr. Tombs, a Learned Non-conformist. Theodulia P. 102.

EDINBURGH:

Printed by JAMES WATSON, One of Her Majesty's Printers. MDCCXIII.



Dec: 10: 1515

1515/8751

IN THE

OF THE

Parliament of Great Brittain

OF

THE

FROM

THE

In his Majesty's

Wherein each

Whether it was the

formers, to join

When they had

Whether our

solemnly pro

the Church of

Whether the

Years by our

By the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the





A VINDICATION

OF THE

Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, &c.



ABOUT a Year and an half ago, a Book was published, entitled, *The Country-Man's Letter to the Curate*; in which the Author promises to give an historical View of the *English Liturgy*, and to confute the Assertions of the Author of the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, concerning the universal Usage of that *Liturgy* in *Scotland*, at the Time of the Reformation. The best Judges were of Opinion, That the *odious Characters*, which he has bestowed, not only upon his Adversary, but many others of the highest Dignity or most eminent Vertue, were to be altogether neglected and despised; and that the *weak Reasonings* and *trifling Evasions*, which make up the rest of his Book, deserved far less any Answer. Hence it was, that none would trou-

ble himself or others, by giving the World a public Censure of that Performance. This Silence was improved by the Presbyterians much to their Advantage; they were so elevated by it, that they boldly gave it out in City and Country, That the Author was a formidable and invincible Champion; that he had entirely baffled the most learned Author of the Charter, and solidly confuted his whole Book, without all Possibility of being answered. How unfair and unjust this is, will appear to any who shall be at the Trouble only to consider the principal Subjects of that excellent and accurate Work.

The most judicious Author has proved, *That the Church of Scotland was not reformed solely, by Persons cloath'd with the Characters of Presbyters.* 2ly, *That our Scottish Reformers of whatever Characters, were not of the present Presbyterian Principles; that they were not for the Divine Institution of Parity, and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy amongst the Pastors of the Church.* 3ly, *That Prelacy and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, was not a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation, nor contrary to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People, ever since the Reformation.* 4ly, *That it was not such, when this Article was established in the Claim of Right.* 5ly, *That supposing the Premisses in the Article were true, they could not be of any Force to infer the Conclusion, viz. That Prelacy, and the Superiority of any Office in the Church ought to be abolished.*

abolished. And here the excellent Author has proved evidently, *That the present Presbyterians have deserted our first Reformers in the Faith, the Worship, the Discipline and Government of the Church.* These are the chief and substantial Heads of that elaborate and useful Book: And all of them are illustrated and supported by so many plain and convincing Proofs, that they must necessarily force our Assent, even supposing all that the *Country-Man* has boldly advanced, was true and certain. He has not dared to meddle with any of these Particulars, except the Second only; and he has been so wise, as not to touch the main Subject even of That. The Design of the Second Enquiry was to examine, *Whether our Reformers were of the present Presbyterian Principles? Whether they were for the Divine Institution of Parity and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy.* For discussing this Point, the learned Author did show, *That while our Reformation was on the Wheel, and for some Years after its public Establishment, there was no such Controversy agitated concerning the Divine Institution of Parity or Imparity, amongst the Pastors of the Church.* 2ly, *That we have no Reason to believe, That our Reformers had any peculiar Motives or Occasions, for adverting to the pretended Evils of Prelacy; or any peculiar Interests to determine them for Parity, beyond other Churches; or that they were more sharp-sighted to espy Faults in Prelacy, or had Opportunities or Inclinations to search more diligently into these Matters, than other Reformers.* 3ly, *That*
none

none of our Martyrs or Confessors for the Reformed Religion, and none of our Reformers, who lived when the Reformation was publickly established, did either directly or indirectly assert the Divine Right of Parity. And for an Instance of this, the Author has insisted at length, on Mr. Knox, who is the chief, if not the only Reformer, that can be pretended to have been for the Divine Right of Parity: He has abundantly answered all that Calderwood, Petrie and others had advanced on that Head; and demonstrated evidently, That Knox was far from entertaining any such Thought. The 4th Topick is, How much Reason we have to believe, that our Reformers proceeded generally on the same Principles with the Reformers of England, where the Government of the Church by Imparity was continued without Opposition. He insists at length upon this Consideration, and proceeds by these Two Steps. 1^{mo}. He represents how our Reformation, under GOD, was principally cherished and encouraged by English Influences. 2^{do}. How, in Correspondence to these Influences, our Reformers were generally of the same Mind, with the Church of England, in several momentous Instances relating to the Constitution and Communion, the Government and Polity of the Church, wherein our present Presbyterian Principles stand in direct Opposition to her. One of the Instances, in which our Reformers agreed with the Church of England, was, That they generally, or rather universally, look'd on the Church of England as a Church so well constituted, that her Communion was

a lawful Communion. And for this, our Author gives Two Evidences, *viz.* *The constant and uniform Practice of our Reformers joining in the Communion of the Church of England, when they had Occasion; as those of the Church of England did with the Church of Scotland: And their open Profession, in their Public Deeds, that they thought it lawful to communicate with her.* The Second Instance of our Reformers agreeing with the Church of England is, *That the Scots used the Liturgy of that Church, for some Years in their Public Devotions.* After some other Instances, our Author proceeds, and brings a Series of plain, positive, direct and formal Proofs, *That our Reformers were far from being of the present Presbyterian Principles; that they were for Prelacy, and actually established Imparity amongst Pastors, as the Government of the Church.* From this short Abstract of our Author's Method for determining his Second Enquiry, it may appear evidently, that supposing all the *Country-Man* has boldly asserted, were true; yet the Resolution, which our Author gives, of all the Enquiries, continues still firm and unshaken. The *Country-Man* has not thought fit so much as to call in question our Author's Determination of Four of the Enquiries: He has ventured only to touch the Second; and yet he has not had the Boldness to deny or contradict our Author's Resolution of it. All he has done, is to attack two or three things, that had been brought for illustrating

strating and proving one of those Topics, which our Author (P. 107) was willing should pass for no more than *rational Presumptions*, till he had confirmed them, by plain, positive and direct Arguments. Tho' we should grant, That our Adversary had proved demonstratively, that our Reformers did not communicate with the Church of *England*, by reason of their Scruples against her Liturgy; tho' we should also grant, That he hath proved, that the *English Liturgy* was never used in *Scotland*; Yet, it is certain, our Author has demonstrated, and the *Country Man* has been forced to acknowledge, That our Reformers were so far from being of the present Presbyterian Principles, that, on the contrary, they were heartily for Set-Forms, and performed the Public Worship by a Liturgy. In like manner, notwithstanding of the *Country-Man's* Performance it must be owned as a plain and undeniable Truth, That our Reformers were so much against the Divine Right of Parity, that on the contrary, they approved of Prelacy, and actually set up Imparity as the Government of the Church of *Scotland*. The *Country-Man* himself has not attacked this Conclusion, which is the Resolution of the Second Enquiry, and has been so far from attempting to weaken or confute the positive and direct Proofs brought for it, that (as I have already said) he has not meddled with above two or three Things, which had been adduced for confirming one of those Preliminary Arguments, that our Author
with

with great Modesty, allows to pass for *rational Presumptions*.

Tho' I hate mortally all Debates and Controversies, and think what is already said more than sufficient, to vindicate our Author and excellent Book; yet the Importunity of some Friends, whose Commands I cannot refuse, has at last prevailed with me, to give my Thoughts more particularly, concerning the *Country-Man's Letter to the Curate*. I shall therefore, by the Assistance of GOD, do it with all possible Brevity and Candour, without Bitterness, Passion or Rudeness. For certainly, Reason and Railing are different Things; unmannerly Scoffing and satyrical Jest, are not Wit; and want of Decency will be alwise thought, by good Men, want of Sense. I heartily wish the *Country-Man* had set me a fair Copy: If his Zeal for the Party had transported him only so far, as to give his Adversary a Wipe now and then, in a cleanly Fashion, he might have been more easily excused: But alas! he hath so far mistaken himself, that he begins his Book with a most remarkable Instance of his good Nature. He acknowledges, *That no Body can deny, that the Author of the Fundamental Charter was a sage Person, a Man of abundance of Reflection*: But, yet with the same Breath, he passes a very severe Censure on him, *as one who wanted Candour, Ingenuity and Honesty*. But, upon what, I pray, is so heavy an Imputation founded? Upon nothing indeed that I can see, but only, *That he*

has set off his Things with an Air, confidently asserted, and plausibly coloured; tho' he seems to contradict himself in the very next Page, when he says, *That his Author's Set of Demonstrations have not a Colour of Probability.* Well, let us grant him, that our Author has done no more, will it follow from thence, that he was disingenuous, and advanced as Truths what he knew to be arrant Falshoods? Certainly not at all: This would be an Inference contrary to the plainest Rules both of Reason and Religion. What if I should grant, that the *Country-Man* has not only given us confident Assertions, but also coloured them plausibly, which a great many are willing to allow; must I therefore follow his Example, and conclude him to be void of Candour and Ingenuity? GOD forbid: *Religion* obliges us to *Charity*, which thinketh no Evil. *Epietetus* a *Heathen Moralist*, can teach us to take every thing by the right Handle. Many affirm, with the greatest Confidence, and even with an Air of Assurance, the grossest Absurdities both in *Philosophy* and *Religion*, and support them with the weakest Arguments; and yet those very Persons are as firmly persuaded of the Truth of what they so boldly assert, as if they were Demonstrations, or Self-evident Principles: Such is the Force and Influence of Education, Passion, Pride, Party, Interest, Ignorance, some Prejudice or other upon the Minds of poor Mortals. But enough of this rash Censure, which can do no Hurt to that

that great and excellent Person, who now enjoys an incorruptible Crown, as the Reward of his Faith and Sincerity, his Constancy and Patience, his successful Labours, and unwearied Diligence in the Service of GOD.

The *Country-Man* gives us the Scope and Design of his Book in these Words, as I find him (the Author of the *Charter*) saying of our Reformers (a), *That they reformed intirely upon the same Principles with England*; which bold Assertion he founds upon two very plausible Arguments. The First, *That it was the constant and uniform Practice of our Reformers, to join in the Communion of the Church of England, when they had Occasion.* The Second, *That our Reformers, in their Public Deeds, openly and solemnly professed, not only that they were of one Religion, (which we acknowledge and hope they are still so) but of one Communion with the Church of England.*---- And he concludes, that the *English* Liturgy was once universally in use in *Scotland*. Whether he has made good these two Arguments, is now my Province to examine. I must here beg the *Country-Man's* Leave to inform him, that our learned Author was so far from bringing these Arguments to prove, That our Reformers proceeded intirely upon the same Principles with *England*, that he never asserted any such thing; but on the contrary, has given a Specimen of several unaccountable Principles opposite to the Doctrine of that Church, which

(a) P. 81.

were defended and maintained by our Reformers: Such as their Principle of popular Re-formations by Force; Of the Necessity of defensive Arms: Of the sinfulness of Passive Obedience or Non-Resistance: Of the Obligation of the Judicial Laws of *Moses* in many Instances, &c. The Arguments against which the *Country-Man's* Letter is levelled, were brought by our Author to prove, *That our Reformers generally, or rather unanimously, lookt on the Church of England, as a Church so well constituted, that her Communion was a lawful Communion.* And after he had set in a clear Light, and sufficiently proved the First of them, taken from the Practice of our Reformers joining in the Communion of the Church of England, he adds in the Place cited by the *Country-Man*, viz. Page 80. 81. *From all which it seems to follow, at least very probably, that they Reformed generally, upon the same Principles; intirely upon the same as to Church Communion.*

The *Countrey-Man* thinks fit before he proceed further, to premise somewhat of the History of the State of Religion, and the public Forms of Devotion in *Henry VIII's* Days, together with somewhat of the History of *Nonconformity* to the Liturgy; being big with Hope, that these Sherds of History will be of mighty Use to him; and particularly, will satisfie any Man, that most part of what M. S. has advanced, even tho' true, can conclude nothing. It is none of my Business at present, to discover nicely

nicely and fully, the many Mistakes and Blunders, into which the *Country-Man* has been led by his Prejudices: That would oblige me to draw out this Work to a prodigious length; and could be of little or no Use, since we expect in a short time an exact Ecclesiastical History of those Times, from one of the best Pens in *Britain*. I am only now obliged to consider these things in the *Countrey-Man's* Histories, which can have any Influence on the present Argument.

But before I do this, it will be convenient to observe, That supposing his Account of the State of Religion, and the politic Forms of Devotion in the Church of *England*, were true and exact in every Title and Circumstance; yet this can make nothing for his Purpose, tho' he boasts and triumphs mightily, as if it had gained him an entire Victory. The Whole amounts to this, That there were still some Remains of the *Romish* Corruptions in all the public Offices, until the Second *Liturgy* of *Edward* the VI. which the *Country-Man* owns, was the same, in all the main Parts, with that which is now used. But what then? Does it follow, from thence, that our *Reformers* did not join in the Communion of the Church of *England*, when they had occasion? None that reasons justly can make any such Inference. The most that can be drawn from this is, that they were not to say *Amen* to those Portions of the Offices, which were repugnant to their Opinions or Prin-

Principles. The famous Mr. Dodwel (as he himself tells us in his *Paranesis ad exteros*) with many others, continued in the Communion of the Church of *England*, a long time after some Prayers were inserted into the *Liturgy*, which they thought immoral; and did not separate, until some of their Spiritual Fathers were removed from their Offices, by a Lay-Deprivation; and others were put into their Places, whom they look'd upon as *Usurpers* and *Schismaticks*. And it is certain, that the same Mr. Dodwel, with a few others of unquestionable Piety and more than ordinary Learning, returned to the Communion of the established Church, after the Death of all the deprived Bishops. It is not my Business here to determine, whether these excellent Persons separated without sufficient Reasons; or returned without contradicting their former Principles: All that I design is, to show from this Instance, that Men of singular Piety and Learning do not think it lawful to separate from an established Church for every Imperfection or Corruption in its public Offices. But lest the *Country-Man* should despise the Authority and Example of those worthy Gentlemen; I am very well satisfied, that this Matter be determined by the Doctrine and Practice of his own Friends. If he please to cast his Eyes upon *The Case of Lay-Communion with the Church of England, considered*; he will find the Lawfulness of it proved from the Testimony of above an hundred eminent *Nonconformists*.
The

The old Nonconformists did generally maintain, That total Separation from the Church of England was unlawful. Mr. Bayly, one of the most Learned of the *Scottish* Presbyterians says of them (b) *They did always plead against the Corruptions of the Church of England, but never against the Truth of her Being, or the Comfort of her Communion.* They taught, That if the Defects or Corruptions of a publick Worship are not essential and fundamental, nor imposed as necessary Conditions of Communion, then they are consistent enough with Communion; and that to refuse Communion for such Defects, would be to look after a greater Perfection, than this present State will admit of. They also argue, That our *Saviour* and his Apostles did not separate from defective Churches and corrupt Worship, but communicated in it, notwithstanding the Corruptions. In the next place, they plead, That to separate for such Defects and Corruptions, would destroy all Communion; and that Separation upon such an Account, is not at all warranted in Scripture. Lastly, they teach, That there is no necessity of separating for the sake of such Corruptions; because one may communicate in the Worship, without partaking in those Corruptions. The old *Nonconformists* have been followed in this by *Baxter, Allen, Brinsley, Lye, Cradacot, Corbet* and others of the most learned of the *Nonconformists*, that lived after the Restoration, who
both

(b) *Dissuasive* C. 2. p. 21.

both joined with their Parish Churches in the Liturgy and Sacraments, and advised and earnestly exhorted their Disciples to follow their Example. But this is not all: It is undeniable (c) *That the old Nonconformists did ordinarily and constantly use the Common-Book in their public Ministration.* And after the Restauration, the deprived Nonconformists owned, that they could not only hear Common-Prayer, but read it themselves.

The *Countrey-Man* pretends, That supposing our Reformers had been native *English-Men*, and had all of them served in the Church of *England*; yet it would not follow from thence, that any of them had been satisfied with, or had conformed to the Liturgy. *Because* (saith he) *many, yea very many of the Ministers of the Church of England, and those too of the very best of them, reclaimed against the Liturgy, or at least something in it. Many, yea very many of them, that have conformed to it, have done it with a confessed grudge of Conscience, not as esteeming it simply lawful, but as the necessity of doing that, or laying aside their Ministry did so.* But soft and fair *Countrey-Man*. Those many and very many, who reclaimed against something in the *Liturgy*, will be reduced to a very small Number, if we go no further down, than the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, to which Period the present Subject confines us. Yea, tho' he had proved most evident-

(c) *Ball's Trial* p. 121. *C. 8.* p. 155. *Read's Case.* p. 7. *Humphry's healing Paper.* p. 5. *Baxter's Disp.* 4. of *Church-Government.* p. 364. *Faircleugh's Life.* p. 157.

evidently, that all of our Reformers had been among the Number of those few; yet this could not serve his Turn, nor support his Cause, which I shall, God willing, show in as few Words as I can. I say, That those who reclaimed against the Liturgy, and yet served in the Church, were very few; and tho' they did reclaim, yet they communicated with the Church in her Public Offices: And this will appear by examining the *Courtry-Man's* Instances.

He begins with the Nonconformity of *Strangers*, and brings Mr. *Bucer*, as the first Example. But how does he prove that he was not a Conformist? *He died before K. Edward's Second Liturgy was composed, and made heavy Exceptions against the First.* It is indeed very true, that *Bucer* was consulted by Arch-Bishop *Cranmer* about the Changes that were fit to be made in the first Liturgy: And Bishop *Burnet* has given us (g) the Substance of his Answer. Tho' he found all things in the *Common Service* and daily Prayers were clearly according to the Scriptures, yet he had a few Exceptions against some things in the other Parts of the Liturgy. But he was far from separating from the *Communion* of the Church upon that account, or advising others to do so. He was remarkable for his Moderation; and for that very Cause was severely taxed by *Calvin*. It is no small Part of his Character, that *Melanthon* and he may be preferred to all the Reformers for true

C

Piety

(g) Hist. Reformer. Part. 2. B. 1. p. 155.

Piety and most tender Care of preserving *Unity* amongst the *Protestant* Churches. The most material thing, which he censur'd, was *Prayers* for the *Dead*: But all who are acquainted with *Antiquity*, know, that this Practice obtained very early in the Church, long before *Purgatory* or any of the *Romish* Corruptions were introduced. The *Country-Man's* Argument will as little prove that *Bucer* was a *Non-conformist*, as it will prove that *Cranmer* was such, or *Ridley*, or any of the rest who compiled the First Liturgy, and who having review'd and amended it, published a Second afterwards. Those pious and learned Men, being sensible of the vast Opposition that was made to the Reformation, resolved to act with all Care and Caution, and to join the Wisdom of the Serpent, with the Innocency of the Dove: Tho' they used all the lawful Means to persuade the People, to forsake their old Superstitions, and to reform themselves in their several Capacities; yet they were far from pushing them on, to make public Innovations by Tumult and Violence, by Schism, Sedition or Rebellion. And in reforming the Public Offices, they resolved not to be too forward in making Alterations, lest they should in that Haste change for the worse, and pull up the Wheat together with the Tares. They considered the Practice of our *Saviour*, who did comply with the *Jewish* Rites himself, and gave to his Disciples a Prayer framed according to their Forms; and institu-
ted

ted two Sacraments *Baptism* and the *Eucharist*, consisting of Rites that had been used by the *Jews*. They therefore resolved to retain such Things as the *Primitive Church* had practised, cutting off such Abuses as the later Ages had grafted on them, and to continue the use of such other things, which tho' they had been brought in not so early, yet were of good use to beget Devotion, and were so much recommended to the People by the Practice of them, that the laying these aside, would perhaps have alienated them from the other Changes, that were necessary to be made. It was no wonder therefore to find some Imperfections in the First Liturgy, which were afterwards amended in the Second.

But (says the Country-Man) Bucer would have been content to suffer some grievous Loss or Pain in his own Body, upon Condition that the Surplice had been abolished in England. What if that learned Man had not only said so, but also thought the Use of the sacred Vestments sinful and unlawful? That would never have hindered him from Lay-Communion; and he had not enough of the English Language to fit him for Ministerial Communion. The Surplice is only used by the Minister, and if his Conscience be satisfied, no Man's else needs to be troubled about it: And this is the Doctrine of the best Nonconformists elder and later, and confirmed by their Practice. But Bucer was so far from thinking the Use of the Vestments sinful, that

he condemned severely Bishop Hooper for refusing to be consecrated in the Episcopal Vestments. I shall give, in Dr. Burnet's Words, the Substance of his Answer to a Letter of Archbishop Cranmer, who had writ to him about that Affair: *(b)* *He thought that those who used these Garments ought to declare, they did not retain them as Parts of Moses's Law, but as Things commanded by the Law of the Land: He thought every Creature of GOD was good, and no former Abuse could make it so ill, that it might not be retained; and since these Garments had been used by the ancient Fathers, before Popery, and might still be of Use to the weak, when well understood, and help to maintain the Ministerial Dignity, and to shew that the Church did not out of any Lightness change old Customs; he thought the Retaining of them was expedient.----- Upon the whole Matter, he thought they sinned, who refused to obey the Laws in that Particular: But he added, That since these Garments were abused by some to Superstition, and by others to be Matter of Contention, he wished they were taken away.*

The Third Argument for Bucer's Nonconformity is, That, when he was a-dying, he declared, *That the ill Lives of People were chiefly to be imputed to the Ecclesiastical Discipline, and thereupon portended a fatal Revolution.* Dr. Burnet, whom the Country-Man cites, tells us *(i)* *That he lamented much the desolate State of Germany,*

(b) Hist. Ref. Part 2. B. I. P. 153. *(i)* Hist. Ref. Part 2. B. I. P. 163.

many, and expressed the Apprehensions of some such Stroke upon England, by reason of the great Dissoluteness of People's Manners, of the Want of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the general Neglect of the pastoral Charge. I believe there is not a good Man of any Communion whatsoever, who is not convinced, That the strict Discipline of the Primitive Church was one of the chief Means, by which the bright and eminent Piety of the Christians was preserved and cherished: But on the other hand, none but these who frame Utopian Societies, and build Castles in the Air, can hope to retrieve the like Strictness of Discipline in the present deplorable State of Christendom, and amidst such a Deluge of Impiety and Wickedness. It is wanting in all the Churches of the World at this Day; and I am afraid, those who pretend most to it, have the least Share of it. I know, it has been the Custom of Presbyterians and other Dissenters, to load the Church of *England* with Want of all Discipline: But I do not remember to have seen any of them, except the *Country-Man* who thought this a sufficient Reason for refusing Communion, even tho' it were true. I may perhaps have Occasion to say something upon this Subject afterwards; but to insist farther on it at present would be of no Use, but to trouble and weary the Reader.

We are told in the next place by the *Country-Man*, That the like Instance may be given of *Peter Martyr* and other *Foreigners*. But these
he

he has not so much as named; neither has he brought any Authority or Argument to prove, that *Peter Martyr* separated from the Church, or so much as reclaim'd against the Liturgy. However, that I may convince him of his Mistake, I shall desire him to consider, that the only Instance of Dissent from the established Rules of the Church in *Edward* the VI's Time, amongst the Pastors of it, was that of Bishop *Hooper* concerning the Vestments. Now the *Country-Man* might have learned from Dr. *Burnet*, whom he cites very frequently, That *Peter Martyr*, who was also writ to upon that Subject, was fully of *Bucer's* Mind, and approved of all he had wrote about it. And he added some very remarkable Words, which the famous Historian sets down in his own Terms (k) copied from the original Letter, and afterward translated after this Manner; *What you wrote to me about Hooper, could not but seem wonderful to me; when I heard it, I was struck with it. It was well, that the Bishops saw my Letters, by which I am freed from their Displeasure. His Business is now at that pass, that the best and most pious disprove of it. I am grieved, and sadly grieved, that such things should fall out among the Professors of the Gospel, &c.*

I proceed to his beloved Instance of *John a Lasco* with his *Germans*, who were erected by Letters Patent into a Corporation, having the said *a Lasco* appointed to be their Superintendent.

It

(k) P. 2. B. 1. P. 154.

It is true, these *Germans* of the *Helvetian* Confession obtained a Toleration; so that they could use their own Rites and Ceremonies, and exercise their own proper and peculiar Church Discipline, *if they had any Discipline*. But what of all that? They were not Ministers of the Church of *England*; and this *Indulgence* is the only one, that was given during the Reign of *Edward*. It is a Saying no less true than common, *That the Exception confirms the Rule*. Conformity was most strictly enjoined by the Law, and no Exception was made from it, but only this of the *Germans*. With what Shadow of Reason then can our Author infer, *That if this Favour was granted to far-off Foreigners, the Government would not deny it to the Scots their Door-Neighbours?* It is plain from the *Acts of Parliament*, and all the other Public Deeds and Histories relating to those Times, that a *Lasco's* Corporation was indulged, and they only: And very good Reasons may be given, why the like *Indulgence* would have been refused to the *Scots*, even tho' they had expected and demanded it. This *Toleration* was obtained with great Difficulty; and the *Country-Man* owns, it was opposed in Council by some, whom, after a very civil and obliging Manner, he is pleased to call *Mad-Caps*, alias *High-Flyers*. And whatever a *Lasco* or the *Country-Man* may have pretended to have been the *King's* Design of granting this *Toleration*; it is certain it was, besides the political Considerations, because
they

they being remote Foreigners, did not understand the *English* Language; and therefore were neither capable of joining in the established Worship, nor able to withdraw the Natives from the *Communion* of their own Church: But none of these things could have been said of the *Scots*. Neither could our *Scotish* Reformers, that were then in *England* have joined lawfully, according to the *Country-Man's* Principles, with *a Lasco* and his Congregation in their Worship, even tho' they had been Masters of the Language: For Mr. *Vines*, a famous *Nonconformist*, tells us (l) That the *Helvetian* or *Switzerland Churches* claim to be Churches, and have the Notes, Word and Sacraments, tho' the Order of Discipline be not settled among them; and (he adds) I am not he that shall blot out their Name. Yea the famous Mr. *George Gillespie* owns (m) that there was no *Excommunication* or any *Suspension* of scandalous Sinners from the Sacrament in the Church of *Zurick*. Now according to the *Country-Man* this was a sufficient Bar from all Communion with such. And there is another Reason, why *Knox* and the other *Scots* could not have communicated with *John a Lasco*, upon the present *Scotish* Presbyterian Principles. *Gillespie* (n) informs us as from *Lavater's* Book *De Ritibus & Institutis Ecclesiae Tigurinae*, that there were diverse things in that Church, which might make his Brother Mr. *Coleman* easily ac-

(l) On Sacrament, C. 19. P. 226. (m) Nihil Respondes, P. 32, 33. (n) Ibid.

acknowledge, that it was not the best Reformed Church: *Such as Festival Days, Cap. 8. That upon the Lord's Day before the Third Bell, it is published and made known to the People, if there be any Houses, Fields or Lands to be sold, Cap. 9. They have no Fasts indicted, ibid. nor Psalms sung in the Church, Cap. 10. Responsaries in their Litany at the Sacrament. The Deacon on the Right-Hand saith one thing, the Deacon on the Left saith another thing; the Pastor a Third thing, Cap. 13.* And thus I have as briefly as was possible, examined his Account of *Nonconformity by Strangers in England*; and have, I hope, proved, That it can be of no Use to him in the present Debate, notwithstanding his mighty Boasts and Triumphs.

I come now to consider his Account of *Nonconformity by the Ministers of the Church of England* themselves, which he hopes, will put his Side of the Controversy beyond all Doubt. His first Instance is Four Bishops, who, tho' they concurred in composing the Liturgy, yet, notwithstanding this, protested in Parliament 1549, against the Act imposing it. I admire the Modesty of the *Country-Man* on this Occasion, who does not conclude from this, That they were also *Non-conformists*. He is pleas'd to infer only, *That these Bishops would be very moderate in exacting Conformity from their Clergy.* But by his good Leave, that is even too much: One may think, such a Thing may be inconvenient to be passed into a Law; and yet, after

the Law is once made, they may think it convenient, and not only so, but even most useful, yea necessary to the *Society* to press the Observance of it, by all the Methods which *Religion* and the Laws of the *Society* allow. This is so obvious to the meanest Understanding, that I will not insist upon it. Only let me add, That a *Bishop* in the present Church of *England*, for whom the *Country-Man* and all his Party, have a more than ordinary Veneration, spoke, wrote, and acted all he could for a *Comprehension*; and yet, I am sure, he has as few of his Clergy *Nonconformists* as any High-Flyer of them all; that is, in plain Terms, None at all.

He brings *Bishop Hooper* for the next Instance. Now, we hear nothing of his Scruples against either Liturgy or Ceremonies, except only that of the *Vestments*; and even these he used when he preached before the King, or in his own Cathedral, and that may be fairly supposed to have been a good part of the Year, or else he was no great Enemy to *Non-residence*. And if it was so, I cannot see how he could think the Use of the Episcopal Habits sinful; far less can it be reasonably inferred, that he renounced *Communion* in the Public Offices, which is the only thing that can do the *Country-Man* any Service.

Latimer, another Martyr and Bishop, is his Third *Nonconformist*; yet the *Country-Man* himself owns, that he is reckoned by some a Friend to
the

the Liturgy. That he was truly such, is evident from all the Accounts that the Historians have given us of him. Ay, but *when the Papists were degrading him, and pulling off his sacred Vestments, he said, Now I can make no holy Water.* What then, I pray you? Will any, except the *Country-Man* infer from that Sarcaſm, that the Martyr had any Scruple againſt the Veſtments? Far leſs can it prove, that he had been diſſatisfied with the Liturgy or Worſhip in King *Edward's* Days. I am already wearied and aſhamed with taking Notice of ſuch Stuff.

I go on therefore to *Miles Coverdale*, Biſhop of *Exeter* in King *Edward's* Reign, who would not return to his See in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time; the Reaſon generally alledged for it was, his diſſenting in Judgment from ſome Ceremonies. *Fuller*, who is cited for this by the *Country-Man*, immediately adds (o), *Yet more probable it is, it was cauſed by his Impotency.* Rumor and bare Surmiſes ought not to be ſuſtained as Proofs by fair and impartial Judges. Infirmity, old Age, and ſeveral other Impediments, on his own Part, might have occaſioned his living in a private Station; or it might have proceeded from other Cauſes on the part of the Government. Not only *Fuller* but Dr. *Burnet* alſo (p), gives his old Age for the Cauſe of his Retirement: And it is certain, that he died *Anno 1568*, in the 81 Year of his Age. But

(o) Ch. Hiſt. b. 9. p. 65. (p) Part. 2. b. 3. p. 395.

let us notwithstanding suppose, that the true Reason of *Coverdale's* not returning to his *See*, was, what the *Country-Man* would have it to be: What then? Does it follow from thence, that when he was in the Exercise of his sacred Office, he did not conform? No such thing can be inferred, but rather the quite contrary. The *Country-Man* has not had in his Thoughts what he wrote in the very next Page, *viz. That Conformity was not strictly urged for the first Seven Years of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.* If it was so, what Necessity was there for *Coverdale's* refusing his *See*, even tho' he had dissented from some Ceremonies? Whereas, under *Edward the Sixth*, when he acted as Bishop, Conformity was so much insisted upon, that it is noted as a singular Case, That the Law was dispensed with as to *Hooper* in a very small Matter, and that only upon some Occasions, and not without the most earnest *Endeavours* and *Solicitations*, (if I may so speak here) as well as express Authority of the King.

The last Nonconformist, he mentions in this Reign, is the *Primate* himself *Cranmer*. He does not indeed expressly call him such; for that had been too staring and void of all Modesty; he hath contented himself with placing him on the Margin, after the same manner as he has done with those whom he pretends to have been *Non-Conformists*, with giving broad Insinuations of that which he was afraid to speak out plainly. But upon what does he found his *Innuendo*?

do? Upon this forsooth, That *Fuller* tells us, the *Arch-Bishop* presented a Book of Prayer, an Hundred times more perfect than the Liturgy used in *King Edward's Days*, but that the same could not take place, because he was matched with so wicked a Clergy. The *Country-Man* is so just as to own, that *Fuller* relates this from the Report of others: But if he had thought fit, he might have told us, that *William Whittingham* and his oppressed Congregation at *Franckfort* (q) will have the Report to ly on the Reporters to avouch it. But tho' it had been literally true, this will never prove that *Cranmer* did not communicate by the established Liturgy, and was therefore to be amongst the *Nonconformists*. The *Country-Man* informs us from the same Historian, That *Arch-Bishop Cranmer*, tho' the highest, yet was not the hottest in Defence of Conformity. Now I am ready to think, that no other Mortal, but the *Country-Man*, would draw from this, That the Primate himself was a *Nonconformist*, but rather the contrary. One might as well reason thus, The Paper, that I write upon, is not the whitest; therefore it is black. The Ink, with which I write, is not the blackest; therefore it is white. If *Cranmer* was the highest Defender of Conformity, tho' not the hottest, then he was certainly at least a Defender of it; and if so, it seems absurd to say or insinuate, That he was a *Nonconformist*, or even a Patron of *Nonconformity*.

What

(q) B. 8. P. 31.

What he adds from *Fuller*, *That in the End of Edward's Reign there was a potent Party disaffected to the Liturgy*, is founded upon a bare Conjecture of that *Historian*. He gives (r) a Passage of the last Sermon that was heard by King *Edward*, and preach'd by *Latimer*, in which the *Admiral* is represented, by Hear-say, as one who had been a *seditionous Man*, a *Contemner of Common Prayer*; and then he makes this Remark upon it, *This probably relates unto a potent Party disaffected to the Liturgy, which now began to be very considerable in England, but much to blame in the Judgment of Godly Mr. Latimer*. Whence I observe, by the Way, that *Latimer* was none of that Party, tho' the *Country-Man* has affirmed it. But tho' it should be granted, that what *Mr. Fuller* suspected concerning this potent Party, was nicely true, without the least *Hyperbole*, yet it cannot serve the *Country-Man's* Purpose. And as little can the more open Discovery of that turbulent and innovating Spirit, afterwards at *Franckfort*, in the Reign of Queen *Mary*, be of any Advantage to him, so long as he has not proved, that any of the Clergy refused to join in the Liturgy, while they were in *England* and in the Exercise of their Sacred Functions there. For he should remember, that he himself (P. 18) represents his *Adversaries* Argument thus: *Our Reformers served in the Church of England: Therefore they conformed to the Liturgy*. Tho' it were as certain as any
Pro-

(r) B. 7. P. 426.

Proposition in *Euclide*, That there were many serving as *Bishops*, Priests and Deacons in the Church of *England*, who entertained Scruples against the Ceremonies, or any Part of the Liturgy; yet if at the same time they were obliged to join, and actually did join in the Worship by the Liturgy, the Reason must necessarily hold, That our Reformers, having officiated publicly in the Churches as *Ministers*, must without Doubt have conformed to the Liturgy. And it is undeniable, That there was no Separation from the Church, during this Period: Yea, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, when the *Nonconformists* were deprived, they still kept Communion with the Church, and for many Years wrote against the *Brownists* for separating. And thus I have examined his Account of *Nonconformity*, so far as the present Controversy is concerned in it.

The *Country-Man* owns (Page 15) that the Argument does not oblige him to bring the History much below the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign; yet he promises to continue it to our Memory, for *Reasons that are obvious*. A judicious Person of no fierce nor fiery Temper, discoursing on this Subject, affirmed, That all the *Country-Man's obvious Reasons were contained in that one, of lapooning and defaming the Church of England, he having published a malicious Libel against all her Abettors in former or latter Times, without respect to Sacredness of Person, Piety of Life, Prudence of Conduct, or any other venerable*

Qua-

Qualities, that were eminent in the most of them; representing them as Mad-Caps, Persecutors and Destroyers of Church and Kingdom. Far be it from me to judge the Secrets of any Man's Heart, or to fasten so heavy a Charge upon him: Yet I am afraid that this Part of his Work, with some Passages elsewhere, has given too much Occasion for that severe Censure. He seems indeed to have spent more Time and Care in reading the virulent Libels of fiery Zealots against the *Government and Rulers of Church and State*, than in managing his Plough; and too inconsiderately has swallowed down their unjust Misrepresentations of Persons and Things, which hath made him unadvisedly jumble Truths with Falshoods, and too often dip his Pen in Gall.

Tho' therefore the rest of his History be altogether foreign from the present Dispute; yet I shall, for a Specimen, examine some of the chief Things in it; and the rather, because what I am to say in very few Words upon these Heads, seems to me a sufficient Answer to all the rest.

He begins with an Observation, That tho' there was an Act of Uniformity past in the first Year of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign; yet *Conformity* was not strictly urged for the first seven Years. I am sure, the Act it self runs in very severe Terms; and in the fifth Year of her Reign, an Act was passed for the due Execution of the Writ *De excommunicato capiendo*
(much

(much like our Letters of Horning and Caption) amongst others, particularly levelled against such as refuse to receive the Holy Communion, or to come to Divine Service as then used in the Church of *England*, with severe Penalties upon those that shall not yield up themselves to the same Writ. And the *Country-Man* is not able to give one Instance of a Minister who performed the Public Worship, during the seven Years, without the Liturgy. On the contrary, the Letter of the General Assembly to the Bishops of *England* in the Eighth Year of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, in favours of the Nonconformists, makes mention of no other Scruples that they had, except those against the Vestments. But moreover this must be added, That supposing the Mildness of the Government in the Beginning of that Reign, had connived at some who had Scruples against the established Form of Public Worship; yet this could have had no Influence upon our Reformers in the present Case, seeing the general Use of the *English Liturgy* in *Scotland* began in the Year 1557, near two Years before Queen *Elizabeth* obtained the Crown. Yea, I will adventure to affirm, That if any of the *Scottish* Reformers, even *Knox* himself, had served as Ministers in the Church of *England*, during that moderate Period, as they were obliged by the Law to use the Liturgy, so they might with a safe Conscience have officiated by it. It is very well known, that some of the *English Clergy* use the

Liturgy, and it only, in all their Public Offices, and yet omit a few things of a *later Edition*. And I can assure the *Country-Man*, That the *English* Liturgy is used in the most of the *Meeting-Houses* of *Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Perth, Dundee, Glasgow, Montrose, Creil, Pittenweem, Brechin, Elgin, Fraserburgh*, and in many other Towns and Parishes in *Scotland*; and yet the Surplice is not used, nor have I heard, that any make use of the *Ring* in *Marriage*, or *Cross* at *Baptism*: Tho', I hope, none of our Clergy is so weak as to have any Scruples against them. It is true, all communicate in the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, kneeling; but I know none, that would deny the Sacrament to one, who could not without Scruple take it in that Posture. Why then might not our *Reformers* have set up the *Liturgy*, in *Scotland*, after the same Manner without the Surplice or *Ceremonies*; even tho' they had thought these last sinful and superstitious? This might be a sufficient Answer to the *Country-Man's* Inference, drawn from some bold and groundless Assertions.

The *Queen* (saith he) began her rigorous Measures upon the Instigation of some disguised Papists about her, and not of the Protestant Bishops; yea so mild were they in exacting Conformity, that for many Years, not only were the Generality of the Ministers connived at in their Nonconformity; but even the whole Ceremonies miss'd narrowly of being thrown out altogether by an Act of the Convocation. If I can bring good Documents for all this, then-I
hope

hope it will sufficiently appear, how miserably the Author of the Charter has imposed upon his Readers by this Argument: Our Reformers served in the Church of England; therefore they conformed to the Liturgy. Tho' enough has been said already to discover the Weakness of this Reasoning, even supposing the Truth of the Assertions; yet I am willing to bestow some few Words upon his good Documents. The First of which he values so highly, that he thought it deserved both a *Prologue* and *Epilogue*; for he introduces it with this Preface: *It is a rare Piece of History, and well worth your Knowledge.* And he concludes it with these Words: *This Testimony I hope is home.* But pray, what and whose is this Testimony? why, truly it is Dr. Burnet's, in a Sermon preached before the House of Commons, January 31. 1688⁸/₉. And his Words are these: " Here suffer me to tell you, " that in the Beginning of Queen Elizabeth's " Reign, our Adversaries (the Papists) saw no " Hopes of retrieving their Affairs, which had " been spoiled by Queen Mary's Persecution, but " by setting on foot Divisions among Prote- " stants upon very inconsiderable Matters. I " my self have seen the Letters of the chief Bi- " shops of that Time; from which it appears, " that the Queen's Stiffness, in maintaining " some Ceremonies, flowed not from their " Counsels, but from the Practices of some dis- " guised Papists. And I have had in my Hands " the original Journal of the Lower-House of

“ Convocation, in the Fifth Year of that glorious
 “ Reign, in which the Matter of the Ceremo-
 “ nies was first argued ; and when it came to
 “ the Vote, it was carried by the greatest Num-
 “ ber of the Voices of the Members that were
 “ present, to lay down all these Subjects of
 “ Contest ; but the Proxies turned it to the
 “ severer Side ”. I hope one may safely say
 without *scandalum magnatum*, that the Bishop
 of S-----, whom he calls Dr. Burnet, is not infal-
 lible, and that all he preached in 1688 was not
 Gospel. It were uncivil and uncharitable in
 me to call into Question the Candour and Ve-
 racity of the famous Historian, as did once a
 very learned Priest of the Church of *England*
 with relation to a certain MS. only it may be
 said, without Offence, That the late ingenious
 Mr. *Wharton*, Chaplain to the most pious Arch-
 Bishop *Sancroft*, has discovered a great many
 Mistakes in his celebrated Work : And we see,
 by daily Experience, that the greatest Attention
 and Diligence cannot secure Men from all Er-
 ror. And therefore it would be no strange
 thing to find a Mistake in a hasty Production.
 Every Body knows, that that Dr. was taken
 up about very weighty Things at that Time,
 and he is remarkable for composing Sermons
 very suddenly, and even some times preaching
ex tempore. I agree with the Dr. in this, That
 the Papists saw no Hopes of retrieving their Affairs,
 but by setting on foot Divisions among Protestants,
 upon very inconsiderable Matters. I believe also,
 that

that the Bishops were far from advising the Queen to severer Methods than were absolutely necessary for preserving the Peace, Safety and Tranquillity of the Church and State ; tho' it had been too much the Humour and Practice of the Party to load chiefly the Bishops and other Clergy, with the Odium of all the Rigour and Severity that the Government has been forced to use against them at any Time : But by no Means can I be perswaded, *That the Queen's Stiffness* (as he calls it) *in maintaining some Ceremonies, flowed from the Practices of some disguised Papists about her :* For the *Country-Man* will have this to be the Dr's Meaning, otherwise this Testimony will be so far from doing him any Service, that it plainly confutes and overturns his rash Assertion, which I shall by and by discover. I'm forced indeed to own, That whatever was the Meaning of the learned Dr. it not is so clearly expressed, but that the Words are capable of a *double Entendre* ; and one Sense is That, which the *Country-Man* puts upon them : But I must beg leave to take it in the Other, which is only agreeable to Truth, and is very suitable to the Character of the Person that speaks, and of them who are the Subjects of the Discourse. If the Dr's Meaning had been, that the Queen's Stiffness proceeded from disguised Papists about her, who were her chief Counsellors, who had the greatest Influence upon her, and could determine her, in spite of the wholesome Advice of all her Bishops and all her
best

best and Protestant Counsellors, to a Wickedness hateful to GOD and Man, even the persecuting those of her Clergy, who were most eminent for their Piety and Learning, and that merely for some paultry Ceremonies not worth a Straw : If the Dr. (I say) had meant no other thing, would he have told such a Piece of *Secret History* to a *House of Commons*, without authentic Documents and sufficient Proofs ? This is not agreeable to his Character. The Dr. might very well learn from the *Letters* of the chief Bishops, what their own Sentiments were ; but he could never perswade the *House of Commons*, that the Bishops would be so foolish as to defame their Sovereign, or endanger themselves by writing so imprudent Letters, and so carelessly that they were even preserved to fall into the Dr's Hands. Yea, tho' the Bishops had so far neglected their Duty to the Queen, and their own Safety ; yet the Dr. knew the Gentlemen of the House of Commons better, than to dream, that they would give any Faith to so great a Calumny, against one of the wisest Queens that ever swayed Scepter ; a Queen, whose Reign the Dr. himself calls Glorious ; a Princess, who had been the happy Instrument of perfecting and settling the *Reformation* in that *Kingdom* ; whose Memory was dear and precious to them, and ever will be, so long as the Protestant Name has a Being. The *Papists* were the only Enemies she had in the Beginning of her Reign ; all her Prudence and Counsels,

fels, her chief Care and Zeal, were imployed in humbling them, and guarding against their Plots and Devices against herself and the *Reformed Religion*. Can it then enter into the Thought of any sober Person, that such a Princess would have harboured Snakes in her Bosom, and followed the Advice of her worst Enemies, to the Ruin of the greatest Interests both of herself and her People? Or that a House of Commons would believe so improbable and impossible a Story, upon the naked Authority of a single Doctor?

Having thus vindicated that learned Bishop from the Dishonour the *Country-Man* has done him, by fixing so false and ridiculous a Sense upon his Words; it remains only to show, what has been the Doctor's true Meaning, and it is this. The wise Queen, understanding that the Papists, despairing to overturn the Church of *England* by all their other Methods, had at last betaken themselves to that Artifice of ruining it, by sowing *Divisions* among its *Members*. And because few, through Mistake, Fancy or Humor, had begun to dissent from the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, they saw this was one of the best Handles for their Purpose; and therefore took hold immediately of it, and mixed themselves with the weak and scrupulous Protestants, disguising themselves, that they might raise an Out-cry against the *Church*, and spur on the People to *Discontent* and *Faction*, as wanting a more spiritual and pure Way
of

of *Worship*. The wise *Queen*, (I say) who was very watchful against the Artifices of the Papists, discovering this, was obliged to defend the established Order of *Worship* with all her Power : She saw, that some were dissatisfied with the *Rites* of the *Church*, and that this Dissatisfaction had grown up into Discontent ; because they had not been gratified with an Alteration. And she also foresaw, that without due Care, the Disease could not stop there, but that the Discontent, if neglected, would bring on *Sedition* ; *Sedition* *Rebellion* ; and *Rebellion* at last the Ruin both of *Church* and *State* : And therefore she was forced to fence the *Rites* and *Orders* of the *Church*, by decreeing severe *Penalties* against those, who, by the private Subtilty and cunning Artifices of the Papists, were incited to endanger the *Publick Welfare*, and expose the *Reverence* and *Majesty* of the *Laws*. This is the only Sense of the Doctor's Words, that is consistent with Truth, and the same which he had said very plainly before, in these Words ; *Our Adversaries saw no Hopes of retrieving their Affairs, but by setting on foot Divisions among Protestants upon very inconsiderable Matters*. And that in Fact it was so, is certain from many Instances, Two of which only I shall set down in the Words of the Author of the *Serious Exhortation to Dissenters*. “ *Faithful*
 “ *Commin* a *Dominican Friar*, passed under the
 “ Notion of a zealous *Puritan*, and was much
 “ admired and followed by the People for his
 “ seeming

“ seeming Piety, spiritual Gifts and Zeal against
 “ Popery. But being apprehended *Anno* 1567,
 “ and accused for an *Impostor*, was examined at
 “ large before the *Queen* and her *Council*, and
 “ put under Bail. When finding that the Cli-
 “ mate was like to be too hot for him, and ha-
 “ ving by a Cheat brought off his Bail, and
 “ told his deluded Followers, that he was ac-
 “ quit by her *Majesty* and the *Council*, and
 “ warned of GOD to go beyond the Seas, to
 “ instruct the Protestants there, and that he
 “ would come again; and having assured them,
 “ that *spiritual* Prayer was the chief *Testimony*
 “ of a true Protestant, and that the Set-Form
 “ of Prayer in *England*, was but the Mass *tran-*
 “ *slated*; and having, with Abundance of *ex*
 “ *tempore* Prayers and Tears, squeezed out of
 “ them a Collection of 130 l. for his Journey,
 “ besides private Gifts, away he goes for *Rome*,
 “ and acquaints Pope *Pius V.* with what he
 “ had done, and by what Methods, and how
 “ odious he had made the Church of *England*
 “ to the *Puritans*, and that it would be a stum-
 “ bling Block to that Church. Upon which
 “ the Pope commended and rewarded him
 “ with 2000 Ducats for his good Service. All
 “ which Particulars are more fully made out
 “ from Secretary *Cecil's Papers*, whose Memo-
 “ rials were lately brought to Light.

“ The other Passage is concerning *Thomas*
 “ *Heath* a *Jesuit*, who, much about the same
 “ Time, was sent over into *England* to act
 F “ the

“ the same Part, which he did, not only by
 “ preaching, but by crying up *Spiritual Prayers*,
 “ and running down all *Set Forms*, as being
 “ without any Warrant from Scripture, by
 “ labouring to refine the Protestants, as he cal-
 “ led it, and to take off all Smacks of *Ceremo-*
 “ *nies*, that in the least tended to the *Romish*
 “ *Faith*. For all which he was mightily flocked
 “ after, and admired every Day more and more.
 “ But *Anno 1568* he was discovered by a Let-
 “ ter, that casually dropt out of his Pocket as
 “ he was preaching in the Pulpit at *Rocheſter*,
 “ importing, That the Council of their *Fra-*
 “ *ternity* had ſent him Collections and Instru-
 “ ctions for carrying on the Work, and that
 “ this Way of dividing Protestants was the only
 “ Means for recalling Men back again to the
 “ *Mother Church*. Hereupon he was examined
 “ by the Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, and did not much
 “ deny the Main of the Charge; and upon
 “ the ſearching of his Lodgings, there were
 “ found ſeveral Books fitted for his Purpoſe, as
 “ againſt Infant Baptiſm, &c. and in one of his
 “ Books a *Licence* from the *Fraternity* of the
 “ *Jefuits*; and a Bull of *Pius V.* giving him
 “ Leave to preach what Doctrines that *Society*
 “ pleaſed, for dividing the *Engliſh* Protestants,
 “ or, as he called them, the *Heretics*. The Iſſue
 “ was, That *Heath* was cloſe imprifoned, ſet
 “ in the Pillory at the High Croſs, his Ears cut
 “ off, his Noſe ſlit, his Forehead branded, and he
 “ condemned to perpetual Imprifonment: But
 “ ſoon

“ soon after he died suddenly, being suspected
 “ to have poisoned himself: The whole Ac-
 “ count hereof being published from the au-
 “ thentic *Register* of the Church of *Rocheſter*. ”
 What has been ſaid may be more than enough
 to ſhow, how falſe the *Country-Man*’s Aſſertion
 is concerning the Queen’s being influenced to
 Severity againſt the *Nonconformiſts* by ſome diſ-
 guiſed *Papiſts* about her.

Let us now examine what Ground he has
 from the Doctor’s Teſtimony to affirm, *That*
not only the Generality of the Miniſters were con-
vinced at in their Nonconformity; but even the
whole Ceremonies miſſ’d narrowly of being thrown
out altogether, even by an Act of the Convocation.
 The Dr. indeed ſays, *That in the Lower Houſe*
of Convocation, in the 5th Year of that Reign,
in which the Matter of the Ceremonies was firſt ar-
gued, it was carried by the greater Number of
Voices of the Members that were preſent, to lay down
all theſe Subjects of Conteſt; but the Proxies turned
it to the ſeverer Side. But all this will never
 prove, what the *Country-Man* has too confidently
 aſſerted. Who does not know, that, by the
 Conſtitution, the Members of the *Convocation*
 tho’ abſent, have Right to vote by *Proxy* as
 well as when preſent; and what is ſo carried, is
 of the ſame Authority, as if they were all pre-
 ſent? What Ground had he then to aſſert,
 That it miſſed narrowly of being thrown out al-
 together, even by an Act of the *Convocation*?
 Eſpecially if it be conſidered, that tho’ it had
 F 2 been

been carried in the *Lower House*, both by the Majority of the present Members and the Proxies also; yet that could not have been called an Act of the *Convocation*. He had forgot, it seems, that there were *Bishops*; and that whatever was concluded in the *Lower House* did not signify any thing, unless it passed also the *Upper*: And the Authority of both *Houses* is absolutely necessary to an Act of *Convocation*. But what if the Ceremonies had been thrown out by the whole *Convocation*? will it follow, that any of the *Convocation* had been *Nonconformists*? I do not indeed see the Consequence: The *Country-Man* may know, that there was a Time, when the *Church of England* was in *Danger*, and a great Noise was raised for a *Comprehension*, for abolishing of Ceremonies, &c. and the *Country-Man* with his Party thought themselves sure of the Majority of the *Upper House*. They were indeed far disappointed concerning the *Lower*: But let us suppose that both Houses of *Convocation* had gone into these Measures, that were designed for the Ruin of the *Church*, would he or any Body else have inferred, That the Majority had been *Nonconformists*? Every Body knows, that to be most false; and that those, who made the greatest Attempts for altering the Rites and Ceremonies, conformed to them in their daily Practice, as much as those who appeared in the Defence of the *established Church*. Besides, I must take Notice, that there was not so much as one Word
con-

concerning the Liturgy in the Convocation, which the Dr. speaks of: All the Arguing was about the Ceremonies. Now (as I have already said) tho' the Ministers had omitted the Ceremonies, yet they might still have performed the Worship by the Liturgy.

Yea the *Country-Man's* other Proof taken from the Letter of the General Assembly of the *Kirk of Scotland*, Anno 1566, mentions nothing but the *Vestments*; by which it would seem, these were the only Things, at which these scrupled who had been deprived. And tho' the *Assembly* say, *That many Thousands both Godly and Learned are otherwise perswaded concerning the Vestments, than the Bishops and Pastors, whose Conscience did not stir with the wearing of such Things*; yet they are far from saying, *That those many Thousands were actual Ministers of the Church*. This had been not only evidently false, but contradictory to what they had owned; for their Letter is directed to the *Bishops and Pastors of England*; and they own, *That their Conscience did not stir in wearing of the Sacred Vestments*. How ridiculous then and repugnant would it have been to add immediately, *But how many Thousands both Godly and learned even of your Number are otherwise perswaded?* Now let the Reader judge, what Reason the *Country-Man* had for boasting, after the Manner he has done, in the following Words; *Lay both these Testimonies (that of Dr. Burnet and the Letter of the Assembly) together, and I hope it will appear plain,*
that

that many, yea very many, even of the best of the Ministers of the Church of England were not satisfied with the Liturgy; and yet had been connived at in their Nonconformity for at least the first 7 or 8 Years of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.

He names Three particularly who did not conform, and yet enjoyed Benefices, viz. Mr. Fox, Dr. Humphrey, and William Whittingham. Now the First was a Prebendary, and the other two Deans, which is no great Sign, that they were for Parity or of Presbyterian Principles. Fox refused to subscribe, which many may do, and at this time actually do, who yet make use of the Liturgy, and conform to all the Ceremonies. Tho' Whittingham was drawn away by the factious Zealots at Francfort, yet he might have returned to a sober Temper, before he was advanced to the Deanry of Durham. And the Country-Man has brought no Authority to prove the contrary. Yea he has not adventured to say, That all or any of them did not perform the Worship by the Liturgy, which yet was necessary to his main Business. And that the Matter may be put beyond all Doubt, let the Country-Man consult his Friend Dr. Burnet, who tells us, (s) *At Francfort an unhappy Difference fell in among some of them, who had used before the English Liturgy, and did afterwards comply with it, when they were in England, where it had Authority from the Law: Yet they thought, that being in Foreign Parts, they should rather accommodate their Worship to those*
among

(s) Hist. Ref. Part 2. B. 2. P. 339.

among whom they lived ; so instead of the English Liturgy, they used one near the Geneva and French Forms.

This is also confirmed by Arch-Bishop Whitgift, who, in his Letter to the Lords of Council, says expressly (t), *It is notorious that in K. Edward's Time, and in the Beginning of her Majesty's Reign, for the Space of diverse Years, when this self-same Book of Prayers was uniformly used, &c. by all learned Preachers maintained, and impugned by none, the Gospel mightily prevailed, &c.*

The Country-Man might have saved himself the Trouble of multiplying Words concerning the Patrons of Nonconformists. Arch-Bishop Whitgift, by his great Wisdom, foresaw the fatal Consequences of the Divisions and Discontents that were raised by the Nonconformists ; and therefore he told them, (u) *I am perswaded that Antichrist worketh effectually at this Day by your Stirs and Contentions, whereby he hath, and will more prevail against the Church of England, than by any other Means whatsoever.* The Queen herself discovered the Necessity of executing the Laws against the Puritans upon many Occasions, and particularly by the Commands she gave to the Lord Keeper Puckering to tell the Parliament : " You are commanded by Her Majesty (says the Keeper (x) in his Speech) to " take heed, that no Ear be given to the wearisom

(t) Fuller, B. 9. P. 146. (u) Def. of his Answer to the Admonition, P. 349. (x) *Apud Pierce new Dis. against Baxter.* P. 109.

“ risom Solicitations of those that commonly
 “ be called *Puritans*.--- As the present Case
 “ standeth, it may be doubted, whether they
 “ or the *Jesuits* do offer more Danger, or be
 “ more speedily to be repressed. For albeit
 “ the *Jesuits* do empoison the Hearts of Her
 “ Majesty’s Subjects,--- yet do they the same
 “ but closely, and only in privy Corners:
 “ But these Men do, both publish in their
 “ printed Books, and teach in all their Con-
 “ venticles, fundry Opinions, not only dange-
 “ rous to the well-settled Estate and Policy of
 “ the Realm; but also much derogatory to her
 “ sacred Majesty and Crown. --- In all which
 “ Things (however in many other Points, they
 “ pretend to be at War with the Popish *Jesu-
 “ its*, yet) by the Separation of themselves
 “ from the Unity of their Fellow Subjects, and
 “ by Abusing the sacred Authority and Maje-
 “ sty of their Prince, they do both join and con-
 “ cur with the *Jesuits* in opening the Door and
 “ preparing the Way to the *Spanish* Invasion,
 “ that is threatned against the Realm.” Now
 if the Queen, Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* and many o-
 thers were in the Right, & alas! too sad and fatal
 Experience hath convinced Posterity, that they
 were not mistaken; it may plainly appear how
 faithfully the Queen was served by these *States-
 men and Bishops*, whom the *Country-Man* endea-
 vours to extol for their Lenity to the *Puritans*.
 I am very far from being an Advocate for Per-
 secution, or justifying the least Severity upon a
 meer

meer religious Account: But on the other hand, I cannot condemn those wise and pious Princes, who, foreseeing the Danger threatned to Church and State, by the Enemies of both, have been unwilling to betray their Trust, or to cast off all Concern for those that GOD had given them the Charge and Care of; and so were obliged to secure the Tranquillity and Safety of their People by severe Penalties against *Disturbers*, tho' perhaps some few well-meaning Persons, through their own Folly, have been involved in them and suffered by them.

All that the *Country-Man* saith about the Clamour and Numbers of the non-conforming Ministers in K. James the I's Time, tho' it were nicely true, yet I think it sufficiently answered by Arch-Bishop *Spotiswood*, who tells us (w), *That when the Rolls were brought in, of those that stood out and were deposed on the Account of Non-conformity, they were found to be 49 only in all England; whereas the Ministers in that Kingdom are reckoned Nine Thousand and above: Such a Noise will a few Disturbers cause in any Society.* The *Country-Man* is so far from being satisfied with the wise & learned *Primate's* Reflection, that it puts him altogether out of Humour, and makes him transgress the Rules of Decency: He calls it, *The grossest Daubing he ever saw*, and says, *The Arch-Bishop was a great Master in that Art.* But how does he justify this his manner-
G ly

ly Censure? He does it by asking a Question or two.

The first Question is, *Were there 9000 preaching Ministers in England at that Time?* To which he answers: *He must be a hardy Man that will affirm that. No, there were not the half of that Number.* Truly, *Country-Man*, he must be a very hardy Man, that hopes to overcome a Friend of yours in Hardiness. But pray, how came preaching Ministers to enter into the Question? The excellent Primate was observing how many of the *Clergy* were deprived in K. James's Time for *Non-conformity*, and exactly according to Truth says, There were only 49 in all *England*: And is it not as true, that the Ministers of that Kingdom are reckoned above 9000? The Subject did no way lead him to distinguish between *preaching* and *not-preaching* Ministers; if there be then any Daubing here, it must ly at the *Country-Man's* Door. But why must a Man be hardy, who affirms, that there were 9000 preaching Ministers at that Time? Certainly all were obliged to read the *Lessons* with the *Gospels* and *Epistles*, and one of the *Homilies*, when there was no other Discourse delivered to the People. And I think, this was Preaching, and the truest and best Kind of Preaching. If the *Country-Man* means by *preaching Ministers*, those who every Sunday stirred up the People by their *Harangues* to Sedition and Contempt of Authority, no Body will contend with him; tho' there were too many such, yet they were

were inconsiderable at that Time, in comparison of those who faithfully adhered to their Duty. But let us understand by *Preachers*, those who read or declaim a Discourse distinct from the Homilies of the Church, how does the *Country-Man* prove, that they were not the half of 9000? Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*, pleading for Pluralities, said, *There were in England 4500 Benefices with Cure, and most of them under 8 lib. in the First Fruits Book, which cannot be furnished with able Pastors, because of the Smalness of their Livings.* Ergo the half is cut off at one Blow. The *Country-Man* is the subtlest Reasoner that ever I encountered: I do not think any Body else can see this Consequence. Did the Arch-Bishop say, That none of all these were furnished with preaching Ministers? No such Thing. Yea, he does not say expressly, That there were no able Pastors in any of them. If one should say, There are a vast Number of Schools, the Encouragement whereof does not amount to 100 Merks, which cannot be furnished with able Masters, because of the Smalness of the Encouragement: Who would infer from this, That the Masters of these Schools were not teaching Masters? Certainly they teach, tho' some of them not so well as others. The Arch-Bishop's Reasoning is much the same; and if his Meaning could not be, that it was impossible to furnish any of those Churches with sufficient Ministers, far less ought he to be understood concerning preaching Ministers: For

there always were and are preaching Ministers, who do not deserve to be called able Pastors. But I must add, that these Livings, whose *First Fruits* were only 10 or 8 *lib. Ster.* were greater than some Persons may imagine. The *First Fruits* are but the third or fourth Part of the real Revenue; whence those small Livings must have been worth 30 or 24 *lib.* to which let us add 20 *lib.* for *Easter-Offerings, Baptisms, Marriages, Burials, &c.* These make up Benefices of 50 or 44 *lib. Sterling*: And it is not long since several Churches in Scotland had not above 500 Merks Scots of *Stipend*; and yet they were furnished with preaching Ministers, yea often with able Pastors. But let us suppose, every two of these smaller Benefices were possessed by one Minister; even in this Case, if the *Country-Man's* Arithmetick be better than his Logick, he may easily compute, that the 9000 will be diminished but by one 4th Part, and that may be made up another Way, as I shall shew by and by. But (says the *Country-Man*) to affirm, there were above 9000, is to impose too rudely upon People's Belief, when every Pedler knows, that there is such a Thing as Plurality of Benefices in England. What if one should say, That Plurality of Benefices increases rather than diminishes the Number of the Ministers? This will seem a Paradox; but yet it does not want a great deal of Probability. It is certain, that more of the dignified and topping Clergy have Pluralities, than the inferior Sort.

And

And tho' when one gets two small Livings adjacent to one another, he diminishes the Number, by officiating himself in both by Turns; yet on the other Hand, when one of the University, a Dean, or Prebendary, &c. has one or two Benefices, he has a Curate in each of his Parishes; and so the preaching Clergy is augmented. But whatever may be in this, the *Country-Man* wants to be informed, that several Parishes in Towns have two or three Priests, all of which do preach on some Occasions. He ought also to add Domestick Chaplains, those, I mean, who have no Livings, many in the Universities, Chaplains of Hospitals, of the Fleet, Land-Forces and Garisons; and if these will not make up the 9000, I am much mistaken.

I come now to his second Question, *Thought his Grace nothing of deposing 49 Ministers in that Scarcity?* Certainly the good Arch-Bishop was very sorry for them, but who could help it? Was it not better, that 49 should be deprived, who would not submit to the lawful Commands of their Superiors, than that Church and State should be turned topsy-turvy by their Peevishness and Folly, even tho' the Scarcity had been as great as is pretended. Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* (x) affirmed in the Parliament 1587, *That England at that Time flourished with able Ministers more than ever before; yea, had more than all Christendom besides.* And the Lord Gray,

(x) Fuller, B. 9. P. 190.

a stout Patron of the Nonconformists, who reply'd. did not at all deny the Thing, but only said, *It was not to be attributed to the Bishops or their Actions, but to GOD, &c.* Far less could there be any Ground for Complaints concerning the Scarcity of learned Ministers so many Years after.

But the Country-Man has another Question. *With what Confidence could Spotiswood, call the greatest Number of the learned, godly and fruitful Ministers, a few Disturbers?* Any, who is but a little acquainted with the History of those Times, or even considers the Country-Man's Accounts about them, will think he spoke modestly enough, when he called them *Disturbers*. But perhaps his Spleen is raised chiefly from his saying, they were few: Now does not he himself immediately confess, that all conformed except 49? and he adds most charitably, *That one State-Argument goes further than Twenty Scripture ones. Their Wives and Children suggested more powerful Arguments, than all their Books could do.* However, 'tis plain from the above Deduction, that the greatest Part of them conformed; half not with their Conscience, and half against it. And thus the Church of England was furnished with a conscientious Clergy. It is no Wonder, tho' he do not spare Princes, Bishops, and others who discouraged his Party, when he falls so severely and unmercifully upon his Darling Friends, whom he has been hugging and extolling all the Time before. Where are now the greatest
Number

Number of the learned, godly and fruitful Ministers of *England*? It is strange, that Prejudice should blind one so much, as to contradict himself within Two or Three Lines. He had spent several Pages to show, that the greatest Number of able, resident and godly Ministers, in King *James's* Reign, did condemn the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*; and yet these very Men, whom again he calls *the greatest Number of the learned, godly and fruitful Ministers*, he immediately, with the same Breath, brands as Men of no Conscience, and Lovers of the World more than Lovers of GOD, except only 49; by which he has abundantly confuted himself, and justified the pious Primate. It cannot indeed be denied, that Interest prevails too much with poor Mortals: But it is no less certain, that our Merciful GOD designs His Threatnings, Chastisements and Afflictions, as Means to awaken our Consideration, to make us sensible of our Sins, and to excite us to Repentance, and bring us back to our Duty. Might not then the Apprehension of these Men's Danger and Troubles have obliged them to consider more impartially what they had been doing, and weigh the Reasons of both Sides more carefully than ever they had done before? For my Part, I would think my self highly uncharitable in the Sight of GOD and Men, if I did harbour and express the same Thoughts about the Compliers, which the *Country-Man* does. Many such Remarks might be

be easily made upon the rest of his *History*; but the Specimen, I have already given, may more than suffice: I will therefore only add a Word or two concerning the *Inferences* which he makes from the Whole.

In the *First* place he struts and triumphs, as if he had taken *Spiritual Babylon* by Storm, and destroyed *Antichrist* himself, Root and Branch; he insults over the poor *Conformists*, as if he had got them under his Feet, and honours them with the glorious Title of the Wisemen of G----- *i. e.* Fools and Dunces. But let him pretend what he please, it will never appear from his Historical Deduction, *That those in England of the highest Character, the best Quality, the most consummate Wisdom, the greatest Learning, have been as little in Love with the Liturgy as the Scotch Whigs are.* Our *Scotish* Presbyterians defame and abhor the *Liturgy*, as nothing better than the *Mass-Book* made *English*; yea they condemn all Set Forms of Worship as sinful and unlawful. Now there is not one of those, of whom the *Country-Man* has been speaking, who did not actually join in the Worship performed by the *Liturgy*, whatever Scruples some of them might have had against a few Things in it. Yea, Mr. *Calamy*, and the rest of the leading Presbyterian Ministers in *England*, within our own Memory, promised to make Use of the *Liturgy* with a few Abatements, if a Comprehension had been obtained. I am far from denying, that there have been Persons of Quality,

lity, wise, learned, and (which the *Country-Man* had forgot) pious Men among the *Non-conformists*; yet I am afraid, if their Number be compared with those of the Party, who wanted these Quailties, they will be found so very few, that they may be as much neglected in the Problem, as the *infinitesima* are by the *Mathematicians*; and much more, if they shall be compared with those of the Church. And if any of the *mighty Talkers* (as he is pleased to speak) of our Side, represent the Enemies of the Liturgy as a Company of weak People, they must be understood, according to the Nature of such Propositions, to mean only, that it is so for the most Part. As for those who say, That the Objections against the Liturgy do flow from Want of Judgment; I believe none of them deny, that there have been and are judicious Men, who are dissatisfied with the *Liturgy*. Perhaps, there was never so great an *Absurdity* asserted by *Philosophers*, nor *Heresy* spread among *Christians*, but they were patronized by some, that did not otherwise want Judgment; and yet, I think, the *Country-Man* will acknowledge, that the Arguments by which they supported their Errors, and the Objections they raised against the Truth, could be no Proofs of their good Sense or solid Judgment.

His *Second Inference* is, *That the Vanity of the Church-Writers is intolerable, who cry up the Service-Book as a perfect Piece.* But I must beg his

H

Leave

Leave to say, That this is affirmed by him without the least Ground: Neither Dr. *Gauden*, Dr. *South*, nor any other of the Church did ever think, or say, That any human Composure could be perfect. They knew very well, that Variations had been made: And tho' the different Circumstances of Affairs and Times may require Words, Sentences, Collects, or Thanksgivings, yea whole Offices sometimes to be added, taken away or changed; yet that cannot be any Prejudice against the Excellency and Usefulness of the *Liturg*y, nor justly be said to add any Perfection to it. As for Example, the *Country-Man* (q) says, *The Amendments that were made after the Restauration, were owing to the Suggestion and Importunity of the Presbyterians*: Now to that Petition of the *Litany*, *From all Sedition, privy Conspiracy, from all false Doctrine, &c.* was added, *and Rebellion*. So that it runs now thus: *From all Sedition, privy Conspiracy and Rebellion, &c.* The Office for the Martyrdom of *Charles I.* and that for the Restauration on the 29th of *May*, were both added at that Time. Whether the Presbyterians suggested these Additions may be doubted. But sure I am, none had more Reason to join heartily in the Confessions and Prayers of those Offices than they; and yet I think, none of them would have thought the Service-Book imperfect only for the Want of them. It is hardly fair to found an heavy Charge upon a Flash of Rhe-

Rhetorick, such as that of Dr. *Gauden*; especially when the Doctor's Words, taken in the most literal Meaning, which the Design and Subject will allow, are most true, and have been found to be true by sad Experience. All that the Dr. says amounts to this, That the Church of *England* would be deprived of its Glory, Charity, Unity and true Religion, if such a Variation were made of the Liturgy as would satisfy the Dissenters; who, whatever some of the more moderate may pretend, will be content with no other Mending, than that which the rebellious *Rump* Parliament made by abolishing it utterly; which the *Country-Man* (z) has expressed by Two very elegant Witticisms. And what was the Consequence of that Mending, a hearty zealous Presbyterian Minister of those Times, Mr. *Edwards*, may teach him. " We
 " (*saith he*) (a) in these last Four Years have
 " surpassed the Deeds of the Prelates, and justified the Bishops, in whose Time never so
 " many, nor so great Errors were heard of;
 " much less such Blasphemies or Confusions;
 " we have worse Things among us than ever
 " were in all the Bishops Days, more corrupt
 " Doctrines, and unheard of Practices, than in
 " Eighty Years before----I am perswaded, if Seven
 " Years ago, the Bishops and their Chaplains,
 " had but preached, printed, licensed, dispersed up
 " and down, in City and Country, openly, a
 " Quarter of these *Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies,*
 H 2 " which

(z) P. 30. (a) Cat. & Disc. P. 73, 74, 76.

“ which have been all these Ways vented by
 “ the Sectaries, the People would have risen
 “ up and stoned them.

His last Inference is yet severer, and that upon the distressed Episcopal Clergy of *Scotland*, whom he calls *so incorrigible Fools*, that they will not be wise, tho' they were brayed with a Pestil in a Mortar ; and all for setting up and introducing the *Liturgy*. But, by his good Leave, as wise Men, as his Party can boast of, are of Opinion, That it will be so far from being a *Bone of Contention* or *Fire-ball*, that it will prove the most effectual Means of putting an End to the *Schism*, at least of lessening the Number of *Separatists*, and fixing the Members of the Church in firm and constant Communion with her : And a little Experience hath justified already their Opinion ; for never were the Meeting-Houses more crowded, nor the Eucharist received by more People, nor more frequently, than since the setting up of the *Liturgy*. And the *Country-Man* and his Friends, whatever they may pretend, seem to fear it will do them no small harm ; elie why all his and their terrible Noise and Clamour against it ? I would advise him to be a little more modest afterwards in his Assertions and Prophecies. He is confident, *That the bringing in of the Liturgy is contrary to the Inclinations of the People ; and that it will be the last Thing, they ever will be reconciled to :* This is as true, as that Presbytry is agreeable to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People. The Aversion,
 which

which some had to it, proceeded meerly from their being unacquainted with it ; and I know many, who after they had been a few Times at Prayers, were so taken with the Worship, that they heartily thanked GOD for the Change, and confessed, they could pray now with more Assurance and Faith, and be more seriously affected with their Devotions than formerly, and could say *Amen* more heartily to the Prayers of the Church, which they had read and considered before, than they could have done to the sudden and uncertain Expressions of a Minister, some of which perhaps they had never heard before, nor thought on, and which possibly they could not understand, nor be satisfied with. He affirms, with no small Heat and Confidence, *That England will not lend her Hand to the establishing the Liturgy, and that they would be the most perfidious Nation in the World by doing so.* If he had not been too hasty to publish his Book, he might have learned more Wisdom and Modesty. The *British Parliament* are not to learn the Sense of the *fundamental Articles* of the *Union* from his Glosses : They have thought it highly just and reasonable to permit the Use of the Liturgy in *Scotland*, and to fence and secure those that conform to it from all Disturbance. Whether this be a lending of the Hand to the establishing of it, or no, I shall not dispute ; but this I know, he dare not call it a Breach of the *Union*.

I had almost forgot a shrewd Insinuation or two against the Clergy who introduced the *Liturgy*, as if thereby they betrayed the *Church*, and enslaved the *Nation*. *Do ye intend thereby* (saith he) *to confirm the old forged Claim of the English Primates to the Obedience of the Scotch Clergy, and thereby betray your Church? Or would you impose upon the Nation a Badge of Slavery, such as Edward I. did, who, when by Perjury and Tyranny he had subdued us, as a Mark of our Slavery to the English, would have us to receive their Liturgy secundum usum Sarum? And would you treacherously act the same Part over again? You are yet worse than your Forefathers in 1637.* I could give him a better Reason why our Forefathers made use of a *Liturgy*? in a very few Things different from the *English Liturgy* at that time, were it either necessary or expedient: But some Country-Men cannot bear all Truths, and are apt to make a wrong Use of them. Our Bishops knew very well, that there was a Set of wicked Men, who made it their chief Study to withdraw the People from the Obedience they owed to their *Sovereign* and *spiritual Fathers*, and therefore caught at every Shadow, from which they could raise groundless Calumnies, and infuse Jealousies in the Minds of the People: The Bishops therefore were in the Right to prevent, as much as was possible, the Occasions of them; but they were wiser Men, than to fancy, that by using the same *Liturgy* with *England*, they could be said, with any Shadow

dow of Reason, to subject the Church to that of *England*, or to acknowledge any Dependency of the Crown of *Scotland* upon the Kingdom of *England*. It is ridiculous to say, either that *Diversity of Liturgies* is an Argument of the *Independence* of the Churches upon one another, where those Liturgies are used; or that the same Liturgy, in several Churches, infers the Dependency of them upon one Primate. Every Body knows, that the *Gallican* Church had a particular Liturgy distinct from the *Roman*, and the *Ambrosian Liturgy* at *Millan* was different from both; and yet it is undeniable, that at the same time both the *Gallican* Church and that of *Millan* did acknowledge the Bishop of *Rome* as their Patriarch. So on the other Hand it is certain, that the *Gallican* Liturgy was used for some Time in the ancient *British* and *Irish* Churches; and at this Day the *English Liturgy* is the *Liturgy* of *Ireland*; and yet no Body was ever such a Fool as to think, that the *British* and *Irish* Churches of old submitted to the Jurisdiction of any Bishop or Primate in *France*; or that the Church of *Ireland*, at this Day, owns any other Primate but the Arch-Bishop of *Armagh*. And the very same Things may sufficiently discover the Vanity of his other *invidious Suggestion*. If the *British* and *Irish* Princes did own no Subjection, to him or them who were the supreme civil Governours of the *Gallican Church*, tho' they borrowed their *Liturgy*; why should
our

our using of the Prayer-Book of *England* make us Slaves to the *English*? Have not our *Presbyterians* got their *Westminster* Confession of Faith from *England*? Have not both they and we borrowed the *Translation* of the Bible from the Church of *England*? Now, tho' one would think these two Things were of much greater Importance than any Liturgy; yet none ever dreamed, that thereby either the Kirk or the Church of *Scotland* were subjected to that of *England*. But besides, I must inform the *Country-Man*, that it is absolutely false, that *Edward I.* imposed upon *Scotland* the Liturgy *secundum usum Sarum*; for by the authentick and original Parchments, belonging to the See of *Glasgow*, kept at *Paris*, it is evident, that the Rites of *Sarum* were received at *Glasgow* in the Time of *Alexander 3d* Pope of *Rome*, long before *Edward Longshanks* his Time. This I had often from the Mouth of an Eye-Witness, the late *Dr. John Jamison* a Priest of the *Romish* Church, a Person highly esteemed by all of both Communions, as well for his great Candour and Modesty, as his eminent Knowledge in all the Parts of useful Learning, and especially the Antiquities of this Nation: And I choosed to set it down in his own Words, which he was pleased to give me under his own Hand. I would fain ask the *Country-Man* one Question, If using the *Rituale*, *Breviarium* and *Missale* of *Sarum* had been the least Badge of Subjection to *England*, would King *Robert Bruce*, or his
 Royal

Royal Successors, have suffered them to continue in the Church of Scotland? And yet it is certain they did, and no other were used over all Scotland in the Public Offices, until the Reformation, except in the Diocess of *Aberdeen*, which it seems had a *Breviarium* of its own for some Time. So much may suffice in Answer to what the *Country-Man* has said for Use after their *Presbyterian Way*: And truly his *Uses* (to speak in his Dialect) are exactly of a Piece with his Doctrines; both are equally agreeable to good Nature, Modesty, Meekness, Charity and Truth.

I should now proceed to the main Subject of the Controversy, but that I am forced to stop a little, and take Notice of something that looks like unfair Dealing. The *Country-Man* upbraids the Author of the Charter with wilful *Blindness* (b), and with *Winking* (c), because forsooth he had said, He had not Opportunity of enquiring what Forms the *English* Reformers used in *Henry VIII's* Time, and yet had Dr. *Burnet's History of the Reformation* before his Eyes: But truly very little Satisfaction can be had from that *History*, if it give no distinct Account, than what the *Country-Man* has cited from it, viz. *All the Changes that the Committee, appointed for the Ceremonies, made, was only the Rasure of some Offices and Collects, and the setting out of a new Primer with the vulgar Devotions for the common People; but the Changes*

I

were

(b) P. 6. (c) P. 56.

were not so great, that it was necessary to reprint the *Missals* or *Breviaries*. We are not told what and how many Offices and Collects were rased: And if I were allowed to blot out whole Offices and Collects out of the *Roman Missals* and *Breviaries*, I think I could leave them very harmless, so that any Protestant might join with them safely. Sure I am, I could make them less liable to Exceptions than the present Offices of the *Greek Church*. And yet Mr. Baxter says (d), *Were I in Armenia, Abassia, or among the Greeks, I would join in a much more defective Liturgy than now.* But what Excuse can the Country-Man make for giving a wrong and false State of the Question? I proceed, (says he) particularly to consider our Reformers enumerate by your Author, and to examine whether he has adduced any Thing, or whether indeed any Thing can be adduced, whence it may be inferred, that they were satisfied with, or conformed to, the *English Liturgy*. And immediately after he gives the State of the Question in the Words of the *Fundamental Charter*; but then he adds, *Or briefly whether they were satisfied with, or conformed to, the English Liturgy.* I am very sure he knew very well, that the Author of the *Charter* never insinuated, far less affirmed, That all our Reformers were satisfied with every Thing in the *Liturgy*. He himself owns, in the very next Page (e), *That our Author acknowledges Knox was displeased with some Things in the English Liturgy.* Therefore the

(d) Def. of Cure, Part 2. P. 176. (e) P. 36.

the true State of the Controversy is only this: Whether it was the constant and uniform Practice of our Reformers, to join in the Communion of the Church of *England*, when they had Occasion? The *Country-Man* sets up for the Negative; but before he begins to examine the particular Instances, he thinks fit to premise this *Postulatum*, That those of our Reformers, who had a Hand in compiling the first Book of Discipline, were certainly no English Liturgy-Men. If he mean, that they were dissatisfied with some Things in the Liturgy, and thought the *Genevan Model* purer; this is what every Body will grant him, and our Author was sufficiently aware of it: But the *Country-Man* must say more, even that they refused the Communion of the Church of *England*, and thought the Terms of it unlawful, else it can never serve his Purpose. The old *Nonconformists* had the same Scruples, which *Knox* had, and greater than the other Five, who compiled the First Book of Discipline; and yet I have proved, they were so far from renouncing the Communion of the Church, that they not only wrote most severely against the *Brownists* for separating, and heard and joined in the Liturgy, but even read it themselves in their Public Ministrations. He might therefore have saved himself the Trouble of that long History he hath given us concerning Mr. *Knox*; unless he designed by it to abuse his unthinking Readers, already prepared for it by the false State of the Question.

He says, " Mr. *Knox* was charged before the
 " *Subprior* of *St. Andrew's*, for teaching, " That
 " the Sacraments ought to be administred as
 " they were instituted by Christ, and practised
 " by his Apostles: Nor ought there any thing be
 " added unto them, nor diminished from them;
 " that no Man, in the Worship of G O D,
 " might appoint any Ceremony, giving it a
 " Signification to his Pleasure : that Prayer for
 " the Dead is Vain, and to the Dead is Ido-
 " latry. " But, notwithstanding all this, I
 say, *Knox* might have communicated, and a-
 ctually did communicate with the Church of
England, when he was in that Kingdom. Pray-
 ers for the Dead were not even in King *Edward's*
first Liturgy. There are no Prayers for the
 Dead in it, except in the Office of Burial, and
 in the End of the Prayer for the whole State of
 Christ's Church in the Communion Office,
 which I shall set down here : *We commend unto*
thy Mercy (O L O R D) all other thy Servants
who are departed from us with the Sign of Faith,
and now rest in the Sleep of Peace, grant unto them,
we beseech thee, thy Mercy and everlasting Peace;
and that at the Day of general Resurrection, we
and all they which be of the mystical Body of thy
Son, may altogether be set on his Right Hand, and
hear that his most joyful Voice, Come ye blessed of
my Father, &c. Now this Prayer quite over-
 turns *Purgatory*, and is so like the Prayers for
 the Dead, that were used very early in the
 Primitive Church, that *Knox*, who reckoned
 Prayer

Prayer for the Dead only to be vain, might have joined so far as to say, *valeat quantum valere potest*. The most he could do, was not to say *Amen* to this Petition ; and therefore without any Scruple he might have joined heartily with the rest of the Worship, much more might he have joined in the Second *Liturgy* of *Edward*, where there was not left the least Vestige of Prayers for the Dead. The Church of *England* teaches no less than *Mr. Knox*, That nothing is to be added or taken away from the Sacraments; That they ought to be administered as Christ instituted them. They also believe, That no Man can institute Ceremonies that signify the Conveyance of a divine Grace and Vertue ; because these are Sacraments in the most proper Sense, and ought not to be used without an expresse Institution in Scripture: But seeing our Thoughts may be sometime expressed as significantly in *dumb Shows*, as in Words, they believe, that it is as much in the Power of the Church to appoint such to be used, as it is to appoint Collects or Prayers ; Words and Signs being but different Ways of expressing our own Thoughts. And *Mr. Knox* is to be understood concerning Ceremonies only in the first Sense, as appears from these he particularly mentions (*f*), *Spittle, Salt, Candle, Hards, Oyl, in Baptism, &c.* to which the Papists ascribe Divine Grace. But whatever was *Mr. Knox's* Meaning, and whatever Influence his Principles

(*f*) *Knox's History*, P. 80. *Lond.* 1644.

ciples ought to have had upon his Practice as to Communion, this is nothing to the Purpose. The Consequences of Men's Opinions cannot, with Justice, be charged upon them when they deny the same. It is enough for our Design, that *Knox* kept Communion with the Church of *England*, which is a thing most certain. He tells us himself (g) *That he was first appointed Preacher to Berwick, then to Newcastle, last he was called to London and to the South of England, where he remained till the Death of Edward VI.* And this the *Country-Man* is forced to acknowledge, and even that *Knox* preached before the King; but then he denies, that he used the *English* Service, or thought it lawful to conform to it, or that any Historian says so. Indeed it would have been ridiculous for any Historian, who had once told, That he had frequently preached in the Churches and before the King himself, to add, that he had kept Communion with the Church of *England* and consequently joined in the *Liturgy*. The Nature of the thing it self shows it. I am sure if one should say, That Mr. *W-----r* had preached this Year in the Chapel Royal, no Body that believed the Matter of Fact would doubt, that he had owned the Communion of that Church as lawful: Since it is contrary both to the Civil and Ecclesiastical Laws to suffer any Separatists to make any such Appearance; and the Case was exactly

(g) *ibid.* pag. 93.

exactly the same then. I have already observed, with how great Difficulty Bishop Hooper was dispensed with as to the Episcopal Habit, only on some Occasions: And who can believe, that one, who refused to join in the Public Worship and condemned the Communion of the Church as superstitious, unlawful and sinful, would have been allowed so freely and publicly the Use of the Pulpit? I desire the *Country-Man* to give an Instance of any, who was permitted to officiate as a Preacher in that Reign, and yet separated from the Prayers. Yea, it is evident from all the Accounts of those Times, that there was no Separation from the Church in Edward the VI's Reign. It must then be no small Degree of Confidence to affirm, That Mr. Knox, or any other of our Reformers, refused to communicate with the Church of England, which they could do no other Way, but by the Liturgy, which was the only Worship used by her. But (says the *Country-Man*) *when he was demanded by the Bishops of Canterbury and Ely, Whether he was of that Judgment, that none might serve in the Ministry within England according to the Rites and Laws of the Realm? He answered, That none might lawfully. And being demanded, Why he kneeled not at the Lord's Supper? he answered, That Christ's Action was most perfect, that it was fittest to follow his Example, that kneeling was Man's Imagination. After hot Reasoning, they said, They were sorry to know him to be of a contrary Mind to the common Order. And he answered*

swered, That he was more sorry, that the common Order should be contrary to Christ's Institution.

The Author of the Charter had observed this Passage, and added from the same *Calderwood* (p. 3.) that *Knox* said, That no Minister in England had Authority to separate the Lepers from the Whole, which was a chief Part of his Office. Whence our judicious Author inferred very justly, That *Knox* did not found the Unlawfulness of being a Pastor in England on the Unlawfulness of Episcopacy, about which he spoke not one Word, but on the King's retaining in his own Hands the chief Power of Ecclesiastical Discipline: And I will add, That he did not found it upon the Unlawfulness of the Liturgy, but only upon the Ceremonies. However culpable *Knox* might have thought the Pastors of the Church of England for not exercising that Power of Discipline, which, by Divine Right, belongs to their Sacred Offices; yet he could never have believed, that, by doing so, they were not lawful Pastors, and that their Communion was to be avoided as sinful and unlawful. This were to make him teach what I have shown is condemned by the Nonconformists themselves, who are far from denying those Churches, where Discipline is wanting, to be true Churches. This were to make him contradict what the Author of the Charter has evidently prov'd he had said on many Occasions; as for Instance, in his *Exhortation to England*, January 12. 1559. " He calls *England* happy, in that GOD, by the
" Power

“ Power of His Verity, of late Years (*i. e.* in
 “ King *Edward's* Time) had broken and de-
 “ stroyed the intolerable Yoke of her Spiritual
 “ Captivity, and brought her forth, as it had
 “ been from the Bottom of Hell, and from the
 “ Thralldom of Satan (in which she had been
 “ holden blinded by Idolatry and Superstition)
 “ to the Fellowship of His Angels, and the
 “ Possession of that rich Inheritance, prepared
 “ to His dearest Children with Christ Jesus, His
 “ Son.” And in the same Discourse, he says of the
 Church of *England*, “ That in the same King
 “ *Edward's* Days, she was a delectable Garden,
 “ planted by the Lord's own Hands.” A great
 many Expressions of the same Kind are cited
 by the learned Author from diverse Writings of
 Mr. *Knox*, which his Adversary passes over in
 Silence, and contents himself with saying, That
 all that can be gathered from *Knox's Admonition*
Anno 1554, is, *That he was glad that England*
was upon the Way of Reforming: Tho' he had been
 told, That Mr. *Knox*, throughout that whole
 Admonition, still speaks of himself as one of the
 Ministers of the Church of *England*, and rea-
 sons there upon Suppositions, and from Prin-
 ciples which clearly condemned Separation
 from the Church of *England*, as it had been esta-
 blished under *Edward VI.* Can any Person be-
 lieve, that Mr. *Knox* would call that Church
A delectable Garden planted by GOD's own Hand;
 which really, in his Opinion, was no Church,
 as having no lawful Ministers, and consequently

no *Sacraments*? Could he have said, That they had been brought to the Fellowship of Angels and the Possession of the rich Inheritance; whose Worship he thought sinful, and Communion impure and unlawful? But I would here ask the *Country-Man*, How it came, that the Bishops demanded, why Mr. *Knox* kneeled not at the Sacrament? How could they know that he did not take it kneeling, if he never communicated with them? There were no Conventicles in King *Edward's* Days; and tho' there had been such, and *Knox* one of their *Preachers*, the most natural Question would have been, Why he separated from the Communion of the Church? What he adds concerning Mr. *Knox's* Behaviour at *Frankfort*, with relation to the Liturgy; and his being one of those, who compiled the first Book of *Discipline*, is acknowledged by the Author of the *Charter*, as the *Country-Man* himself takes Notice; and that might have been sufficient to put him in Mind, That the State of the Controversy was not, Whether Mr. *Knox* was satisfied with every Thing in the *Liturgy*? But, Whether he and our other Reformers thought it lawful to join in the public Worship, and actually did keep Communion with the Church of *England*, as they had Occasion? The ingenious Author (b) had observed, that *John Knox* was fond of, and zealously maintain'd, a Principle, which had got too much Footing amongst Protestant

Di-

(b) Fund. Ch. P. 167.

Divines, viz. That the best Way to reform a Church, was to recede as far from the Papists as they could; to have nothing in common with them but the Essentials; whatever was of its Nature indifferent, and not positively and expressly commanded in the Scriptures, if it was in Fashion in the Popish Churches, was therefore to be laid aside, and avoided as a Corruption. Now in Consequence of this Principle it was, that *Knox*, who was the chief Compiler of the first Book of *Discipline*, did condemn the Observation of Fasts and Festivals, and the Cross in Baptism; which not only then were used in the *English Church*, but had obtained in the Primitive Church long before Popery was ever heard of. As for kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and Singing or Reading at Burials, the Book of *Discipline* does not absolutely condemn them; whatever the *Country-Man* may pretend. The Compilers say, That, at the Supper Christ sat with his Disciples; and therefore they judge, that Sitting at Table is most convenient to that holy Action: And tho' they judge it best, that neither Singing nor Reading be at the Burial-----Yet they are not so precise in this, but that they are content that particular Churches, with Consent of the Minister, do that which they shall judge most fitting. But notwithstanding the Two or Three Things in the Book of *Discipline*, that are contrary to the Practice of the *English Church*; yet *Knox* was far from thinking, that the Communion of the Church of *England* was sinful or unlawful. By the same

Argument I shall prove, that Mr. *Knox* did not communicate with the then Church of *Scotland*, or join in the Use of the *Genevan Liturgy*. The *Country-Man* is at much Pains (*i*) to prove, that there are Footsteps of the Observation of *Festival Days* in the old *Scotch Liturgy*; and he affirms, it is more than probable, that until the Year 1560, when the *Book of Discipline* was framed, the *Holy-Days* had been observed in *Scotland* by the *Reformed*. This last Assertion is most certain, and for the present I shall also grant the First: If it was so, then Mr. *Knox* could not, without Sin, communicate with the Church of *Scotland* before the Year 1560, nor join in the Use of the *Genevan Liturgy*; for it appears from the First *Book of Discipline*, that he condemned the Observation of *Holy-Days* as superstitious. Again, the old *Scotish Liturgy*, allows Funeral Sermons, or some comfortable *Exhortation to the People, touching Death and Resurrection*: But on the other hand, Funeral Sermons are discharged by the *Book of Discipline*, and are said to *nourish Superstition*. Tho' (as I have already shown) Reading and Singing at Burials were not absolutely condemned by the *Book of Discipline*; yet the Authors thereof discover plainly their Aversion to them. Now it is evident from the *Book of Discipline* it self, that this Practice obtained in the Church of *Scotland*: For there it is said, (*k*) *We think it most expedient, that the Dead be ac-*
com

1 (*i*) P. 70, 71. (*k*) Of Burial.

accompanied to the Place of Burial with some honest Neighbours, without either Singing or Reading, and without all Kind of Ceremonies formerly used. And a little after, They are content, that particular Churches, with Consent of the Minister, do that which they should find most fitting, &c. Now tho' Knox's Liturgy has a Form of the Visitation of the Sick, yet it has none for Burial; but on the contrary appoints, That the Corps shall be reverently brought to the Grave, accompanied with the Congregation without any further Ceremonies. Seeing therefore the Church of Scotland used a Form of Burial, and none of that Kind was ever in the *Genevan Book*, nor appointed by the Book of Discipline; it follows clearly, That Knox's Scheme did not obtain in Scotland, and that there also the Liturgy of *England* was used, in which alone there is an Office for Burial. And thus the Book of Discipline, instead of doing the *Country-Man* Service, has furnished us with a new Argument, That the *English Liturgy* was used in Scotland *An. 1560.*

The *Country-Man's* next Particular concerning Knox, is, That he moved the *Assembly* to write, and carried the Letter to the Bishops of *England*, against the imposing the *Surplice*. Many may dissuade the imposing of a Thing, which yet they think lawful enough: But let us grant, that the *Assembly* did absolutely condemn the *Surplice*, tho' no such thing can be collected from their Letter; What would follow from thence? I have heard the Prayers of the Church
of

of *England* read in *Scotland* a Thousand times, and yet never saw the Surplice used there: How then will it follow, that Mr. *Knox* could not join in the Public Worship by that Liturgy in *Scotland*? After this long and tedious Discourse, to which the *Country-Man* has forced me, I leave it to the impartial Reader to judge, whether he had Reason to boast so much of his Performance upon this Head. It is indeed plain from his Deduction, that *Knox* had some Scruples against some Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, and thought the *Genevan*, or rather his own Model more pure; but we have not seen one Word of his thinking that any Petition or Expression in the *Liturgy* was sinful or unlawful; and consequently nothing has been brought by the *Country-Man* that can in the least persuade us to suspect, that *Knox* refused Communion with the Church of *England*: So that he hath been at a great deal of needless Trouble to prove what no Body denied, and what, he knew, his Adversary had frankly acknowledged.

The *Country-Man* observes, That *Knox* caused add, in *Edward VI's* Second Liturgy, the *Rubric* explaining the Reason of Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, which was struck out in *Q. Elizabeth's* Time, to gratify the Papists; and was not restored but by the Importunity of the *Presbyterians* after the *Restoration* of *Charles II.* All I shall say to this, is, That neither *Knox* nor the *Presbyterians* can claim great Honour by this;

this ; nor can the Liturgy be said to be improved by it. Yea it is one Instance of many, by which it may appear, what little Advantage the Church can gain by granting Concessions to peevish Disturbers. The Doctrine and Sense of the Church of England concerning the consecrated Elements of the *Eucharist*, is abundantly plain from the *Articles* and other public Documents ; what Necessity then was there of any such *Rubric* ? And if they expunging it in Queen Elizabeth's Time, did remove a stumbling Block out of the Way of Papists, who for several Years came to the public Worship ; and on the other hand, the restoring of it in Charles II's Time, has noways obliged the Presbyterians, but they continue still to condemn that most reverent Gesture, and to load it with all the same hard uncharitable Words, as much since, as before that *Rubric* was restored, What hath the Church gained by the Change, or how can the *Liturgy* be said to have been made better by it ?

As to the *Country-Man's* Digression concerning Fox's *Martyrology*, and the Author of *Knox's* History, which last he will not affirm was written by *Knox*, as we now have it ; I shall content my self to set down here, a Citation out of an *Essay on Mr. Sage's Life*, which I saw in *August. 1711.* long before the *Country-Man's* Letter was published, or at least, before it was seen by any of that great Man's Friends.

“ And here I will frankly and candidly acknowledge, that in this Preface, he hath fallen,

“ len,

“ len, by Inadvertancy, into a Mistake, but
 “ such an one as is very pardonable: And I
 “ chose the rather to mention it, because his
 “ Adversaries have not taken the least Notice
 “ of it; and it is the only Error, I have obser-
 “ ved throughout all his Writings. Mr. *Sage*
 “ pretends to bring infallible Proofs, that *Knox*
 “ was not the Author of the *History* commonly
 “ attributed to him: The Arguments brought
 “ by him are indeed so strong and convincing,
 “ that it would be impossible to resist the Force
 “ of them, if the Passages on which they are
 “ founded, were not the Interpolations and
 “ Additions of Mr. *David Buchanan*, who pub-
 “ lished a new, but very unfaithful, Edition
 “ of that Book, at *Edinburgh* 1644. This was
 “ the Edition which Mr. *Sage* made use of, and
 “ all the Places cited by him from Pag. 447,
 “ 449, 306, and 286 are intirely wanting in
 “ the old Editions; and particularly in that prin-
 “ ted *Anno* 1584. Tho’ therefore Mr. *Sage*’s
 “ Proofs do evidently and undeniably discover
 “ the disingenuous and unfair Dealing of the
 “ Presbyterians in obtruding upon the World,
 “ for the genuin Work of Mr. *Knox*, the Inter-
 “ polations of one who wrote more than 70
 “ Years after his Death; yet they can be of no
 “ Use in determining the Question, Whether or
 “ no *Knox* was the Author of that Book, as
 “ we have it in the old Editions? Neither can
 “ I agree with Mr. *Sage*, that the most Reve-
 “ rend and Learned Arch-Bishop *Spotiswood* has
 “ proved,

“ proved, by Demonstration, that Work to be
 “ *spurious* : For that great Man’s Reasoning is
 “ wholly founded upon the Reference that is
 “ made to the *Acts and Monuments* of Mr. Fox,
 “ which, he pretends, were not published till
 “ 12 Years after *Knox’s* Death : And yet it is
 “ plain, that this is a Mistake. I am persuaded,
 “ that the oldest Copy which the *Archbishop*
 “ saw of that Book, was printed so late ; but
 “ it is certain that the first Edition was publi-
 “ shed Eight or Nine Years at least before *Knox*
 “ died : For *William Reynolds*, in his *Refutation*
 “ of *Whitaker*, cites an Edition of the *Acts and*
 “ *Monuments* printed at London 1563 (*the very*
 “ *same with that which the Country-Man saw*) and
 “ they are cited by *Stapleton* in his *Preface* to
 “ the Translation of *Bede’s History*, Anno 1565.
 “ Yea *Nicolaus Harpsfield*, under the borrowed
 “ Name of his Friend, *Alanus Copus*, wrote and
 “ printed his *Dialogues* against them, Anno 1564,
 “ 1565. But when *Fox’s* Book was first publi-
 “ shed, or whether *Knox* was the true Author
 “ of the History or not, is a Matter of Moon-
 “ shine ; and neither Mr. *Sage’s* Reasonings in
 “ his Book, nor the Support of the Cause,
 “ which he undertook, depend in the least up-
 “ on the Determination of these Niceties.

I shall consider, in the next Place, what the
 the *Country-Man* has said concerning Friar *Alex-
 ander Seton*. He tells us, That *Seton* went from
 Scotland Thirty Three Years before the legal
 Establishment of the Reformation in the Year,

1527 or 1528, Six or Seven Years before King Henry had renounced the Pope's Jurisdiction: And then most wittily he asks, *Did he flee from Popery in Scotland that he might join with it in England?* I believe indeed, that was not the Design of his Flight. But what is it to the Purpose, when he fled? It is enough if he lived, as he truly did, unto the Time when considerable Advances had been made, in the Reformation, both of Doctrine and Worship. The Country-Man has been told very often, That pious and wise Men will take Care not to separate from a Church for some Corruptions, especially when no other Public Worship can be had: With what Confidence then, can he deny, that Mr. Seton did not join in the Communion of the National Church? He owns that he was Chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk. Every Body knows the Duke was no Separatist; and therefore who ever performed Worship in his Family, must have done it according to the Laws of the Kingdom. And it is as ridiculous to say, That Seton used any other Way; as it would be for me to say, That the Moderator of the last Assembly read the *English Prayers* before the Brethren. Ay, but he taught, *That the Law of God is the only Rule of Righteousness, and that if God's Law be not violated, no Sin is committed:* A Principle (saith the Country-Man) that quite destroys the Church's Power to impose Ceremonies. He has not brought the least Argument to confirm this: The Friar meant no more by these Words, than that

that the Scriptures are a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners; for he knew very well those sinned, who refused to obey the Civil Magistrate, even in things indifferent; and that all things in the Church of God are to be done with Order and Decency; and that it belongs to the *Governours* thereof to appoint the Circumstances and Modes of Worship, that is to say, the Ceremonies. Yea, *Calvin* himself and some other Divines, who extended that *Principle* as far as any in those Days, had Rites and Ceremonies in their several Churches, to which they exacted Obedience from the People; and they were far from encouraging any Separation from the Liturgy or Communion of the Church of *England*, upon that or any other Account.

Alexander Ales is the Third Reformer, mentioned by the *Country-Man*, concerning whom he says, *Whatever his Principles were, the Settlement of our Reformation was noways influenced by him, because he left Scotland 26 Years before the Legal Establishment, and never returned.* Here I must take Notice, that he is always sure to throw in something or other quite foreign to the Purpose, which may indeed impose upon the Weak and Ignorant, but can do himself no Honour with Men of Candour and Judgment. What have we to do here with the Settlement of the Reformation or its legal Establishment in *Scotland*? Could none have Influence upon the Reformation but those who were then living in *Scotland*, when it was established by Law? By

this Way of arguing, Mr. *Patrick Hamilton*, Mr. *Wisbart*, and all those, who did, and suffered most for opening the Eyes of the People, and rooting out the Corruptions of Popery, must be excluded from the Honour of Reformers, and be said to have had no Influence upon the Reformation. Mr. *Aless* lived several Years in *England*, was in great Favour with *Henry* the Eighth, and his Favourite *Cromwel*; was called the King's Scholar, and was entertained in *Cromwel*'s House. Now the Character and History of *Henry* the Eighth, will never suffer any to suspect, that one could be so highly in his Favour and Grace, and so much caressed by his prime Minister, if he had refused to join in the Communion of the Church. Neither is it possible, that Dr. *Aless* could have been admitted to reason and dispute in the *Convocation*, unless he had been of their Communion. The *Country-Man* insults here, as if he had discovered a great Blunder of our *Author*, in calling *Aless* a Member of the *Convocation*. If one should say, that St. *Athanasius* was a Member of the Council of *Nice*, and *Dominicus a Soto* a Member of the Council of *Trent*; every Body would understand his Meaning to be, not that they had Definitive Voices in those Councils, which was the Privilege of Bishops only, but that *Athanasius* was desired to reason against the *Arrian* Heresy in the *Nicene Council*, and *Soto* to give his Sentiments upon the Subjects that were considered in

in the *Tridentine-Council*. I am confident the accurate Author meant no more ; and the most that can be made of it, is an Impropriety of Speech. *Aless* disputed in the Convocation against the Bishop of *London*, and maintained, that there were but Two Sacraments; hence the *Country-Man* draws two Inferences. He disputed against the Bishop of *London*; therefore he was not of the Church of *England*: And he maintained there were but two Sacraments; therefore he was not of the same Principles with the Church of *England*. As the Last Inference is nothing to the Purpose, tho' in some Part true ; so the First is altogether ridiculous. He might as well reason thus; Dr. *Aless* thought the Bishop fallible, therefore he was not of the same Communion: Or, Sir *Hugh Campbell* wrote to several General Assemblies, That it was the indispensable Duty of all Christians to use the LORD's Prayer in their Devotions; therefore he was not of their Communion. *Aless* left *England*, Anno 1540, and was Professor of Divinity for many Years in *Lypsick*; but it will not follow from thence, that he did not communicate with the Church while he was in *England*. The *Country-Man* is forced to acknowledge, that *Aless* translated into *Latin* the First Liturgy of King *Edward* for *Bucer's* Use, and caused it to be printed at *Lypsick*. But he says, *This is so far from being an Evidence, that he or Bucer were pleased with the Book, that it says the contrary ; for they were all sensible of its*
Cor-

Corruptions, and were resolved to have it mended. But whom does he mean by *All* here? certainly he must mean *Cranmer* and the other Bishops, who only had Interest and Authority to mend it, and obtain the Civil Sanction to the Amendments. Perhaps he would here again insinuate, that the Primate was not of the Communion of that Church, of which he was the spiritual Head under Christ. Indeed, the same very Arguments, by which he proves that *Alefs* and our other Reformers did separate from the Church of *England*, will as effectually prove the same concerning *Cranmer*. Tho' that excellent Prelate, the chief Instrument of carrying on and advancing the Reformation in *England*, was convinced of the Corruptions both in Doctrine and Worship; yet he still joined in the Public Communion, until at last, by prudent, fair and peaceable Means, he settled in the Church a Liturgy and Worship intirely purged from all the Remains of Superstition, and in End sealed the same with his Blood. Neither is it to be thought, that he would have employed Dr. *Alefs* to have translated the Liturgy, if he had known him to be an Enemy to that Communion. And if Dr. *Alefs* was so much employed in the Concerns of the Church of *England*, even after he had removed into *Germany*, is it to be supposed, that he would altogether forget his Native Country, or neglect the Affairs of his Mother-Church? Certainly he did study to be serviceable to them,

them, by all Methods that were in his Power. He could not want Occasions of seeing many of his Country-Men both in *England* and *Germany*; and by his Letters he was able to do much Good, and have very great Influence upon the Reformation, especially when he died not before the Year 1565, more than Five Years after the Establishment of the Reformation in *Scotland* (i).

The *Country-Man* acknowledges, That *John Fife* and *Mr. Mackdowal* staid Six Years in *England*, and that the first became Divinity-Professor at *Lypsick*, and from thence returned afterward to *Scotland*; and that the other became a Burgo-Master in one of the Towns in *Saxony*, but never returned to his native Country. Since then they left *Scotland* at the same Time with *Dr. Aleß*, and staid all the same Years in *England*, and retired to the same *Saxony* with him, the *Author* of the *Charter* had good Reason to say, That they were of the same Principles with him. But says the *Country-Man*, Then certainly they were not of English Principles. They were just as much of English Principles as *Cranmer* was at that Time. 'Tis true indeed, *Dr. Aleß* and the rest were displeased with the Corruptions both of Doctrine and Worship, that as yet remained; but, notwithstanding these, one of *Aleß's* Principles was, as we have shown from his Practice, That Communion with the Church of *England* was lawful; and that is sufficient

(i) Vide *Aleß's* Life, by *Dr. Mackenzie*.

sufficient to our Purpose. It is more credible, (says the *Country-Man*) that Mr. Fife returned to Scotland, of German than English Principles. But the *Country-Man* did not reflect, that the German Divines of Saxony, and particularly of *Lypsick*, were Lutherans, and consequently no Enemies to Imparity amongst the Pastors; and retained Images in their Churches; and, together with a Liturgy, used more Ceremonies in their Worship than the Church of England ever used, after the second Liturgy was composed: And if Mr. Fife returned with such Principles, this is all we stand in need of, for the present Controversy.

John Mackbee is the next, who (as the *Country-Man* confesses) fled to England about the same Time, viz. Anno 1534, with *Aless* and the rest, and was liberally entertained by *Shaxton* Bishop of *Salisbury*: All that is brought to prove, that he did not communicate with the Church, is only a long Story about *Shaxton*, to show, that he was a proud and ill-natur'd Man, an Hypocrite in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and an Apostate in *Q. Mary's*. But what Advantage can he make by this? It cannot be denied that *Shaxton* was Bishop of *Salisbury*, and *Dr. Maccabeus* was in singular Favour and Friendship with him; and therefore it must necessarily follow, that *Mackbee* imitated the Example of his Country-Men, and did not separate from the Communion of the Church. If *Shaxton* was secretly and in his Heart a Papist,

pist, the Argument is still the stronger. It is not probable, he would have shown so great Kindness and Respect to one, whose Enmity to that Party carried him further than was usual, or was practised by his Friends and Country-Men of the same Principles. But he left England, departed into Dutchland, and thereafter became Chaplain to the King of Denmark, and died in his Service, Anno 1550. But what of all that? Every Person knows, that these in Denmark have Episcopacy, a Liturgy, and more Ceremonies than the present Church of England: So that Mackbee was a Church of England Man or Liturgy Man, notwithstanding the confident Boasts of the Country-Man.

Sir John Borthwick is now to be considered, who was charged with Heresy Anno 1540, (as Spotswood and Petrie inform us) for maintaining, That the Heresies commonly called the Heresies of England, and their new Liturgy, was commendable. I will not contend whether Fox or Spotswood be more to be relied upon in the Accounts they give of the Heads of Borthwick's Accusation; Spotswood might have got from his Father a more exact Information of Scottish Affairs, than a Stranger readily could get. And tho' the Rasures out of the Popish Rituals were not made at that Time; yet it is certain, that some small Changes were made after Henry the Eighth renounced the Pope's Supremacy; and upon that Account Cardinal Beaton and his Clergy might call it a new Liturgy. It is very

true, *Borthwick* in his Answer to that Article concerning the Heresies of England, as set down by *Fox*, has these Words: *What Religion at that Time was used in England, the like the whole Realm of Scotland did embrace. In this Point only, the English Men differed from the Scots, that they had cast off the Yoke of Antichrist, the other not; Idols were worshipped of both Nations, the profaning of the Supper and Baptism was alike to them both; wicked Superstition reigned on both Parts, and true Worship was deformed and defaced with detestable Hypocrisy.* But Sir *John* was very much mistaken; King *Henry* had made several considerable Steps towards the Reformation, besides the renouncing the Pope's Supremacy, long before the Year 1540. It were tedious to give a particular Account of them, any Body may see them in *Dr. Burnet's History of the Reformation*: I shall only for an Instance refer the Reader to the *Injunctions* given out in the King's Name by *Cromwel*, Anno 1538 (k), upon which the learned Historian makes this Remark: *These Injunctions struck at three main Points of Popery, containing Encouragements to the Vulgar, to read the Scriptures in a known Tongue, and putting down all Worship of Images, and leaving it free for any Curate to leave out the Suffrages to the Saints.* The Country-Man himself acknowledges, that the *Rasures* out of the Breviaries and Missals were made within two Months after *Borthwick's* Libel, and tho' he

(k) Hist. Ref. Par. 1. B. 3. P. 249. 250.

he pretends these made but a small Change in the Worship, yet Dr. Burnet (l) says, *It is likely that most of those Scandalous Hymns and Prayers, which are addressed to Saints in the same Stile, in which good Christians worship G O D, were all struck out; because they were now condemned, as appears by the Extract of the other Book set out by the Bishops.* Borthwick having fled into England was kindly received by Henry the Eighth (m), and employed by him in a Commission to the Protestant Princes in Germany, for a Confederation betwixt him and them. He was sent in December 1550 to the King of Denmark, with private Instructions, for the Marriage of the Lady Elizabeth, as King Edward himself assures us in the Journal written by his own Hand, P. 21. *apud Burnet Hist. Ref. Vol. 2.* So that he lived at least after the first Liturgy was compiled. And for any thing we can know from the Historians, he died not before the Reformation was perfected in England by Edward the Sixth's second Liturgy; and therefore could not miss to be a Church of England-Man, seeing there were no Separatists in those Days.

We proceed to Thomas Guillam, the first public Preacher of the Reformed Religion in Scotland, by whose Sermons John Knox got the first lively Impressions of the Truth. This Guillam, after Arran the Regent (whose Chaplain he was) apostatized, withdrew and fled into England, without returning; from which it

M 2

is

(l) Part. B. 3. P. 295. (m) Spotswood, P. 70.

is reasonable to conclude, he followed the common Course with our other Reformers there. To this the *Country-Man* replies, *If we may judge the Master by the Scholar, seeing Knox was far from being a Conformist, there is very great Ground to believe, that Guillam, by whom Knox was principled, was none either.* But I have proved that the Scholar did communicate with the Church of *England*, and therefore according to this Reasoning, *Guillam* the Master, used the same Practice. The *Country-Man* says, *If he had conformed in England, he had grown worse than when he was in Scotland; for when he was the Governour's Chaplain, he preached against the Invocation of Saints; whereas when he went up to England, and at least Seven Years after, Invocation of Saints was a Part of the Liturgy.* I have already shown, that it was allowed to leave out the Suffrages to the Saints, near Five Years before *Guillam* went to *England*, and that the Rasures out of the Public Offices were made two Years or more before it; for he left not *Scotland* till the Year 1542. And he has been often told, that one may join in a corrupt Worship without Sin, or homologating the Corruptions: Yea it is sufficient to my Purpose, if our Reformers, who lived in *England* thought so, and did practise according to that Principle. I have sufficiently answered already the *Country-Man's* other Reason, *viz.* That he left *Scotland* Eighteen Years before the Settlement of the Reformation, and so could have no
Hand

Hand in settling it on *English* Principles. Mr. *Guillam* contributed very much to the Reformation before he fled from *Scotland*, and no doubt continued afterwards to promote it, when he was in *England*; and his not returning to *Scotland* is no small Argument, that he thought himself safe enough in the Communion of the Church of *England*.

The Principles and Practice of Mr. *Guillam* will further appear, from the Sentiments and Behaviour of his Colleague *John Rough*, the Regent's other Chaplain, who fled to *England*, and preached some Years in the Towns of *Carlisle*, *Berwick* and *Newcastle*, and was afterward provided to a Benefice by the Arch-Bishop of *Tork*, where he lived till the Death of King *Edward*. When Queen *Mary's* Persecution turned warm, he fled and lived some time in *Friesland*. He came to *London* about some Business *Anno* 1557. was apprehended and brought before *Bonner*; questioned, If he had preached any since he came to *England*? He answered, *He had preached none; but in some Places, where godly People were assembled, he had read the Prayers of the Communion-Book set forth in the Reign of King Edward VI.* Questioned again, What his Judgment was of that Book? He answered, *He approved it, as agreeing in all Points with the Word of G O D;* and so suffered Martyrdom. One would think, this Account did determine the Business, without all Controversy: But the *Country-Man* is so stout a Champion, that he will

will fight every Inch of Ground, before he be forced to yield. *Tho' there be (says he) a considerable Flaw in this Account from Spotswood, who takes his own way of telling a Story; yet he acknowledges Mr. Rough seems to be more for our Purpose than all the rest together.* However, he hopes that Two or Three of his *Notes* will make the Account concerning Mr. *Rough* pretty harmless to his Party.

The *First Note* is, *Mr. Rough had been absent Thirteen Years, and died Three Years before the legal Settlement of the Reformation in Scotland; therefore he had no Hand in settling it upon English Principles.* I have often seen *Notes* much more obscure than the Text. I must therefore beg the *Country-Man's* Pardon to set it in a clearer Light. The Meaning is this: *Mr. Rough* having used his utmost Endeavours to advance the Reformation in *Scotland*, was forced to flee into *England*, where he served as a Minister of the established Church for several Years, and at last suffered *Martyrdom* for reading and approving of its *Liturgy*, in the very Year when the *Lords of the Congregation* ordered the same *Liturgy* to be read in all the Congregations of the Reformed in *Scotland*: Therefore he never kept Communion with the Church of *England*, nor approved its *Liturgy*, nor could have any Influence upon the *Reformation* in *Scotland* by his pious Labours when present, nor Advice, Exhortations and Letters when absent, neither by

his

his Practice and Example when alive, nor Martyrdom when dead.

His Second Note is, That while he was in Scotland, tho' he received an English Pension, yet he was not of English Principles; for he taught, That the Sacraments of the New Testament, ought to be administred as they were instituted by Christ and practised by His Apostles; and that there is nothing to be added to them or diminished from them. A Doctrine which quite nullifies Crossing in Baptism and Kneeling at the Communion. Enough has been said concerning this Principle, when we were discoursing of Knox (m), I shall only add, That whoever is not wilfully blind, may know, that the Church of England does not make Crossing at Baptism a Part of that Sacrament, nor Kneeling a Part of the Lord's Supper. Mr. Baxter (n) says, I never heard any thing yet to prove Kneeling unlawful; there is no Word of G O D for, or against any Gesture. The Circumstances of the Sacraments are left to the Determination of the Church; v. g. Christ and His Apostles certainly used Immersion in Baptism, and this was the general Method used over all the Catholic Church, and it continued in Scotland at least to the Reformation, and in England many Years after it in some Places; and yet I know none who condemn Sprinkling.

His Third Note is, That Rough earned his Bread in Friesland in Queen Mary's Time, by knitting Hose

(m) P.

(n) Christ. Direct. P. 616.

Hose and Caps. Ergo he never conformed to the Liturgy.

The Fourth Note is, " He answered to the Fourth Article, *That tho' he did well like the Communion in King Edward's Days, yet he had not ministred nor received the same in England, since the Queen's Reign, neither yet knew any that had the Books thereof.* Whence it may seem credible, that he was not fierce upon it. How this agrees with what he confessed in answer to the Eighth Article, *That since his last coming into England, he had in sundry Places prayed and read such Prayers and Service as is appointed in the Book of the Communion, is more than I can tell.*" This Difficulty may be very easily removed, even supposing that the entire Liturgy was meant in *both the Articles.* The Persecution was very violent that Time; and it was a sufficient Argument of Guilt, if the Liturgy was found in the Hands of any Person: Might not then Mr. *Rough* have had a Copy himself, which he made use of for the reading Prayers. I can instance in 500 Persons in *Scotland*, who can join in the Liturgy as Laics, as well without the Book as with it, except the *Psalms*, which the Minister might read wholly in such a Case as the present. Or might not some Books be brought to a House, and Mr. *Rough* not know by whom? Or might not those, in whose Hands he had seen the Books, have been dead; or have fled from the Violence of the Persecution? Or if still alive and in *England*, might he not

not have known, that they had given away the Books, or destroyed them for fear of the Danger? I think it will be convenient to show here the *Country-Man's* Injustice to Arch-Bishop *Spotswood*, in whose Account of this Affair, he pretends there is a Flaw. I am sure, all that the Bishop says is plainly affirmed by *Fox* in his *Martyrology*. To the Fourth Article Mr. *Rough* answered, *That he did well like the Communion used in K. Edward's Days, &c.* To the Eighth he answered and confest, *that sithens his last coming into England, which was about the 10th Day of November, he had in sundry Places in the Suburbs of London prayed and read such Service and Prayers as is appointed in the Book of the Communion, and had willed others to do the like, both Men and Women.* And it is most evident from the Second Article and the Answer to it, That Mr. *Rough* approved the Liturgy as agreeable in all Points with the Word of GOD. The Second Article of the Accusation is thus set down by *Fox*: *Thou hast mistiked and reprov'd the Religion and Ecclesiastical Service as it is now used in this Realm; and hast allowed the Religion and Service used in the later Years of King Edward VI. and so much as in thee hath lyen hast, by Word, Writing and Deeds set forward, taught and preached the samen openly; and in sundry Places affirmed that the said English Service and Doctrine therein contained, is agreeable in all Points to GOD's Word and unto Truth, condemning utterly the Latin Service now used in the Queen's Reign, and inducing*

N

others

others by thy Example to do the like. To this Mr. Rough answered: That he then did and had before misliked the Order of the Latin Service then used, and did also allow the Service used in the later Time of King Edward's Reign, for that the Holy Scripture doth the same: And therefore he granted, that he did teach and set forth the said English Service, as in the said Article is objected. This I think may serve sufficiently to justify the Primate and his Account.

The Country-Man's Fifth Note is, One may approve the English Liturgy in a Dispute against Papists, who yet does not simpliciter approve of it. This Evasion is of a piece with the rest: Was Rough disputing with the Papists? Was he not charged with Heresy? And if he could have said, that he did not approve the Liturgy, and so have saved himself from the Flames, Would he have thrown away his Life rashly, by saying what he did not believe to be absolutely true? He said, That he did allow the Service used in the later Time of Edward, for that the Holy Scripture doth the same: He granted, That he did teach and set forth the said English Service as in the said Article is objected. Now it was objected in the Second Article, That he had affirmed, that the said English Service and Doctrine therein contained, is agreeable in all Points to God's Word and unto Truth. If Rough did not therefore simpliciter approve the English Liturgy, I do not see how it is possible to do it: His Words are as plain

as can be, and he sealed his Testimony with his Blood.

The *Country-Man* has yet another Note, of which he seems to be very vain, tho' it be a most ridiculous Blunder. He grants that the whole Liturgy is sometime called the *Communion-Book*; yet he says, *By the Communion-Book in Rough's Process, is to be understood only Edward's Communion-Book*, which was easily subscribed to by some, who could not be induced to subscribe to the Liturgy. The *Country-Man* talks here without Book in a literal Sense: If he had ever seen *King Edward's Communion-Book*, he might have saved himself and me some Trouble. Yea, if he had consulted his ordinary Author *Doctor Burnet*, with Care, he would have informed him (p) “ That the Bishops and
 “ Divines deputed to reform the *Communion*
 “ *Office*, did not at once mend every Thing
 “ that required it, but left the *Office of the Mass*
 “ as it was, only adding to it, that which made
 “ it a *Communion*. It began first with an Ex-
 “ hortation to be used the Day before, which
 “ differs not much from that now used. Only
 “ after the Advice given, concerning Confession,
 “ it is added, That such as desire to make *Auri-*
 “ *cular Confession*, should not censure those
 “ who were satisfied with a general Confession
 “ to G O D; and that those, who used only
 “ Confession to G O D and to the Church,
 “ should not be offended with those who used

N 2

“ Au-

(p) Hist. Ref. Part. 2. B. 1. P. 64.

“ Auricular Confession to a Priest-----After the
 “ Priest had received the Sacrament, he was to
 “ turn to the People, and read an Exhortation
 “ to them ; the same we now use, only a little
 “ varied in Words. After that, followed a De-
 “ nunciation against Sinners, requiring them,
 “ who were such, and had not repented, to
 “ withdraw, lest the Devil should enter into
 “ them as he did into *Judas*. Then after a
 “ little Pause, to see if any would withdraw ;
 “ there was to follow a short Exhortation, with
 “ a Confession of Sins and Absolution, the very
 “ same which we do yet retain. Then those
 “ Texts of Scripture were read, which we yet
 “ read ; followed with the Prayer, *We do not*
 “ *presume &c.* After this the Sacrament was to
 “ be given in both Kinds ; first to the Mini-
 “ sters then present, and then to the People,
 “ with these Words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus*
 “ *Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy Body*
 “ *unto everlasting Life ;* and, *The Blood of our*
 “ *Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, pre-*
 “ *serve thy Soul unto everlasting Life.* When all
 “ was done the Congregation was dismissed
 “ with a Blessing.” If the *Country-Man* will
 not believe this Account, let him look to the
 Book it self, which he may find in *L’ Estrange’s*
Alliance of Divine Offices, and his own Eyes
 may satisfy him. If *King Edward’s* Commu-
 nion-Book be taken by it self, without including
 the Mass, and those Words blotted out of the
 first *Exhortation*, that allow Auricular Confes-
 sion;

fion ; then indeed it may be harmless enough,
 and the Story may be true, which he brings
 from *Smith's History of Virginia, &c.* concerning
 two Ministers, who subscribed the Liturgy of
Garnsey and Jersey, i. e. King Edward's Commu-
nion-Book, and yet would not be persuaded to
 subscribe the *Book of Common-Prayer* : And per-
 haps by the *Books of Communion*, in the Answer
 to the Fourth Article, of which *Rough* said, He
 knew not any that had them, may be under-
 stood *Edward's Communion-Book* only ; and then
 the Agreement of this, with his Answer to the
 Eighth Article, will be very plain : But no
 Body of common Sense, that hath ever seen
King Edward's Communion-Book, will ever
 pretend, that the *English Service*, in the first
 Article approved by *Rough*, as agreeable in all
 Points to G O D's Word and unto Truth, is the
 same Book. The *Communion-Book* was formed
 in the beginning of *Edward's* Reign, as soon as
 he was in Circumstances to pursue the Refor-
 mation ; and being imperfect, and wanting a
 very necessary Part, *viz.* the Prayer of Con-
 secration, and therefore to be supply'd by the
Mass it self, it was wholly laid aside as soon as
 the first *Liturgy* was composed : Whereas the
English Service approved by *Rough*, was that
 which was used in the later Days of *Edward*
VI. and is opposed to the whole Service of the
Romish Church : The Service in the First Ar-
 ticle is the same, with the Service and Prayers
 appointed in the *Book of the Communion*, which
 he

he confessed, in the Answer to the Eighth Article, he had read in sundry Places since his last coming to *England*. Now it is most certain, these could not be King *Edward's* Communion-Book; for it, is evident by the Account we have given of it from Doctor *Burnet*, that there is nothing in it, that could be read, except when the Sacrament was actually given; and yet *Rough* declared, in his Answer to the Fourth Article, That he had not ministred or received the Communion in *England* since Queen *Mary's* Reign. This I may say, with all Modesty, is a plain Demonstration, that the Service and Prayers read by Mr. *Rough*, were not King *Edward's* Communion-Book, but his Second Liturgy.

The Author of the *Charter* had instanced in Mr. *Wisheart*, as one of our Reformers, who had spent some Time in *England*, and so (saith he) returned to *Scotland* of *English*, I am confident not of Presbyterian, Principles. Mr. *S.* never meant, by being of *English* Principles, that he believed all the Doctrines which were then taught in the Church of *England*, but only that it seemed, or was probable, he communicated with the Church, even in that imperfect and corrupt State. But it is sufficient to his Purpose, that he returned without the Presbyterian Principles, and particularly that of Parity and Aversion to Liturgies, and this he proved from his being for private Communion. The *Country-Man*, with his ordinary Air of Contempt, replies, That Mr. *Wisheart* was now not only

only a Prisoner in the Hands of his Enemies; but suppose he had been at his Liberty, the whole Churches of this Nation were possessed by Popish Priests, and he could not have had the Sacrament according to Christ's Institution. Now, what of all this? I am sure, a Person, in a dying Condition, and Persons so confined to their Chambers by Infirmary and old Age, that it is morally impossible for them to be carried to Public Places of Worship, and continue so long as the Public Devotions last: These, I say, are under no less Necessity either of communicating privately, or wanting altogether so divine and comfortable a Mean of Grace, than Mr. *Wisheart* was at that Time. They are as much confined to their Beds or Chambers, as he was to his Prison; and tho' there were as many Ministers as there are Houses in the City where they dwell, who give the Sacrament according to Christ's Institution; yet this makes them as little capable of communicating in a Public Assembly, as if there were no Minister at all. If then Mr. *Wisheart* was for private Communion in a Case of Necessity, this is only what we affirm to be lawful, and the Presbyterians deny; it follows plainly, that he was not of Presbyterian Principles. But the Presbyterians, (saith the Country-Man) don't reject private Communion, as if they thought the Sacraments being celebrated under a Church-Roof hallowed it the more; or that it were profaned by being celebrated, either in the open Fields or a common House, in case
of

of Necessity. He needs not be at too much Pains to convince us, that the Presbyterians have no great Regard to consecrated Places, and that they are sufficiently in Love with the open Fields; but for what do they then reject private Communion? *They do it (saith he) because of the ill Principles upon which it is founded, viz. That the Sacrament confers Grace ex opere operato; and the vast Encouragement it gives to Sin; Men imagining, that after an ill Life, some sudden Sorrow for Sin, with a hasty Absolution and the Sacrament, will be a Passport for Heaven, which (says Dr. Burnet) is too gross a Relict of the worst Part of Popery.* Lo here is a most false and scandalous Innuendo. Is it possible that he can be so ignorant as not to know, that the Church of Scotland and England condemn that Error of the *opus operatum*, as much as any Presbyterian in the World. For my Part, I know none who believes it; and tho' there were to be found any so presumptuous, as to expect Salvation by a sudden Sorrow for Sin, a hasty Absolution and the Sacrament, without a hearty and sincere Repentance; yet that can never be a sufficient Reason for refusing the Sacrament to dying Persons, who earnestly desire it, and give all the Signs of true Contrition and Repentance, which their Condition and Circumstances can allow. It would not only be Folly, but even Madness, to throw away every Thing, which had at any time been abused, or is capable of being abused. At that Rate we
must

must not only reject the Sacred *Scriptures*, but all other Things that are absolutely necessary to temporal, spiritual, or eternal Life. Sad Experience does teach us, that too too many, who have led very licentious and wicked Lives, expect to get Heaven by a few Ejaculations and the Prayers of a Minister; and yet I think, the *Country-Man* will not deny, but it would be barbarous and cruel, if a Presbyterian Minister did refuse to visit such on their Death-bed, and give them the Assistance of their Prayers.

He insinuates, That there are other obvious Inconveniencies of private Communion; but since he has not told us what they are, I can say nothing about them.

The Author of the Charter had said, That *Knox* gives us fair Intimations, that Mr. *Wisheart* ministred the Sacrament by a Set-Form.

“ I know (saith that learned Author) King
 “ *Edward's* Liturgy was not then composed;
 “ but it is not to be imagined, that the Re-
 “ formers in *England* in *Wisheart's* Time ad-
 “ ministred the Sacrament without a Set-Form.
 “ The extemporary Spirit was not then in
 “ Vogue: And why else could Sir *John Borth-*
 “ *wick* have been charged with the great He-
 “ resy of commending the *English Liturgy*?
 “ However, I shall not be peremptory, because
 “ I have not the Opportunity of enquiring at
 “ present, what Forms the *English* Reformers
 “ had then. All I shall say, is, If they had
 “ a *Liturgy*, 'tis very probable *Wisheart* used it;
 O “ for

“ for as *Knox* tells us, when he celebrated the
 “ *Eucharist* before his Execution, after he had
 “ blessed the Bread and Wine, he took the
 “ Bread and brake it, and gave to every one of
 “ it, bidding each of them, *Remember that*
 “ *Christ had died for them; and feed on it spiri-*
 “ *tually* : So taking the Cup he bade them, *Re-*
 “ *member that Christ's Blood was shed for them.*
 “ So *Knox*, Word for Word; which Account,
 “ I think, seems fairly to intimate, that *Wis-*
 “ *heart* used a Form; but if he did, what
 “ other could it be, than such as he had learn-
 “ ed in *England*? ” From which Words it is
 plain, the learned Author is far from being po-
 sitive, either that the Church of *England* had
 as yet reformed the Communion Office, or
 that *Wisheart* used it, but only that *Knox's*
 Words seem to insinuate some Form of Words,
 as it is plain they do; for the *Martyr* repeated
 the same Words to each Communicant: And
 from thence the Author infers, that he had
 learned it in *England*; but he was far from
 saying, that Mr. *Wisheart* believed the corporal
 Presence. It was enough to his Purpose, that
 the *Martyr* was for *Private Communion*, and used
 a *Set Form* of Words: These sufficiently disco-
 vered, he was not of *Presbyterian Principles*.
 It would be easy to make some not unpleasant
 Remarks upon his *Set of Demonstrations*, some
 of which prove only, what no Body ever denied;
 and others do not even so much as that: Were I
 not weary with considering and pursuing his
 idle

idle Chat, I might put him in Mind, that Mr. *Wisheart* was most willing to receive the Sacrament from the *Sub-Prior*, one of the Popish Clergy, if he could have got it *according to Christ's Institution* (i. e.) *under both Kinds*, as not only (q) *Spotswood* but *Knox* himself assures us: But when the *Sub-Prior* asked the *Bishops*, If they would permit the Sacrament to be given to the Prisoner? The *Cardinal* answered, in Name of the rest, *That it was not reasonable to give any Spiritual Benefit to an obstinate Heretic, condemned by the Church.* Now if this Favour had been granted to *Wisheart*, he must have received the Sacrament after the *English* Form at that Time, in *Latin*, and not in *English* or *Scotch*. 2dly. He must have received it not in common Bread, but by the *round clipped God*; if I dare, without Irreverence, use *Knox's* and the *Country-Man's* Stile. 3dly. It would have been put by the Priest into his Mouth, and not into his Hands. 4thly. He would have got the *Host* whole, the Bread not being broken. 5thly. He would have taken it kneeling and not sitting. So that Mr. *Wisheart* would have conformed to the Practice of the *Scotish* and *English* Churches at that Time, in all the *Country-Man's* Instances, except only that of *Communion under one Kind*.

The *Country-Man* leads me now to *John Willock*; and he acknowledges, that, for the Love of Religion, he left his Country and lived in *England*, till *Queen Mary's* Persecution forced him

(q) *Spotf.* P. 82. *Knox* P. 67.

him flee to *Embsden*, where he professed Medicin for a Year or two; and that he was very instrumental in carrying on the Reformation, after his Return from *Friesland* and settling in *Scotland* Anno 1555. But he endeavours to prove by Two Arguments, that he did not join in the *English* Communion, nor conform to the *Liturgy*. The First is, *When he went to England in King Henry's Time, he was committed to Prison for differing from the then Church of England. Ergo* he did not communicate with the Church, no not in King *Edward's* Reign, nor join even with his Second Liturgy. Let the Reader judge, if this be not an unanswerable Argument. The Second Argument is, *He was one of those who compiled the first Book of Discipline*; the Weakness of which has been sufficiently discovered.

I hasten to the next Reformer *William Harlaw* (whom the *Country-Man* calls *John*, I know not why) he served some Years in the Church of *England* with a good Approbation: But the *Country-Man* says, *He might have officiated in that Church as a Minister till he had grown gray-headed, and yet not conformed to the Liturgy*. I have already shown, that none could have been a Minister in that Church in those Days, unless he performed the Public Worship by the Liturgy. But the *Country-Man* bids us remember, *That King Edward's Second Liturgy was not in Force till Eight Months before he left England*. I should have given him Thanks, if he had brought any Evidence for this: I am sure *Knox* and *Spotswood*

wood insinuate (r) as plainly as can be, that he did not leave *England* before *Queen Mary's* Persecution. But what tho' he had left that Kingdom sooner? If he conformed to the *First Liturgy* (saith the *Country-Man*) he was not ill to please, and can make no Argument against us. Certainly he was not so ill to please as our *Presbyterians*: Tho' there had been a few Pins of the Temple rotten, he was not afraid that it should have fallen about his Ears. If he conformed to the *First Liturgy*, he would much more conform to the *Second*; and if he conformed to either of them, this is all we want. With what Reason or Truth then can the *Country-Man* say, That he makes no Argument against them? But whatever he pretends, he dreads Harm by him, for he endeavours to detract from him. Tho' *Knox* says, That his *Erudition* excelled not, yet he adds, for his whole and plain Diligence in Doctrine, he is to this Day worthy of Praise, and remains a fruitful Member within the Church of Scotland.

We are at last brought to *John Spotswood* Superintendent of *Lothian*, who went to *England* in *Henry VIII's* Time, and became familiar with *Arch-Bishop Cranmer*. The *Country-Man* insults his Adversary, because he called him his *Disciple*: But every Body else will easily grant, that if he was familiar and intimate with the *Primate*, he must have been his *Disciple*. *Dr. Burnet* in his *Abridgment of the History of the Reformation*, P. 279, 280. (f) may

(r) *Knox* P. 98. *Spotf.* P. 92, 93. (f) See also *Hist. Ref.* Part I. P. 320.

may inform him, That *Cassils* had got these *Seeds of Knowledge* at *Lambeth*, under *Cranmer's* Influences, which produced afterwards a great Harvest in *Scotland*; and that the other Prisoners (who had been taken at *Soloway-Moss*) were instructed to such a Degree, that they came to have different Thoughts of the Changes that had been made in *England*, from what the *Scottish* Clergy had possessed them with. Now if *Cranmer* was at Pains to instruct *Cassils* in Matters of Religion, who can doubt, but that he would be as careful about *Mr. Spotswood* his intimate Friend, who, he knew, was more capable to advance the Reformation as a Minister? And here, by the Way, I must observe, That the excellent Author of the *Charter* had brought this Citation, from *Dr. Burnet*, to show how much the Reformation in *Scotland* was influenced by *England*, and confirmed it by the Authority of *Buchanan*, who reckons 7 Noblemen and 24 considerable Gentlemen who were enlightened at that Time in *England*; yet his Adversary passes over in Silence this and many other unanswerable Instances. It will be ridiculous to say, That because this was many Years before the legal Settlement of the Reformation in *Scotland*: Therefore so great a Number of Noblemen and Gentlemen could have no Influence upon advancing the Reformation. His great Author can tell him, That these *Seeds of Knowledge*, which one of them got under *Cranmer's* Influences, produced afterwards a great Harvest in *Scotland*. And it will

will be as little to his Purpose to use his other Shift, That the Church of *England* it self was not much reformed at that Time. *Cranmer* and many others were using all prudent and lawful Endeavours to bring the *Reformation* to Perfection; and they were at much Pains to instruct those Gentlemen in the Truth, *An. 1542*: And I am sure they would teach them neither Parity amongst Ecclesiastics, nor Contempt of Liturgies, nor any other Presbyterian Principles. As little is it to be supposed, that the Archbishop (by whose Means *Spotswood* was brought to the Knowledge of the Truth, as his Son assures us, P. 344.) would instil any such *Whims* into his Disciple's Head. So that what the *Country-Man* adds, concerning *Spotswood's* leaving *England* before any Liturgy was in *England*, except the *Missale* or *Breviary*, can do him no Service. The other Argument, from his being one of those that compiled the *First Book of Discipline*, was answered in *Knox*; and it appears plainly from his dying Speech how much he regreted the Change of the old Policy (1).

The *Country-Man* advances an Assertion of which he boasts mightily, and marks it on the Margin with a *Notandum bene*; and truly the whole of it is this, That tho' all our Reformers had read and used the *English Service*, yet that would not infer their approving of it. He says, This, he doubts not, will seem a very strange Thought in him; but he will make it good by the Judgment of

(1) *Spotsf. Hist.* P. 344.

of the *University of Oxford*. It is indifferent to me, whether he speaks in Earnest or Banter. Sure I am, if he had reflected upon this Thought in the Beginning of his Work, he might have saved himself and me a great deal of Trouble. The Whole of the Question, was, Whether or no our Reformers joined in the Communion of the Church of *England*, and made use of their Liturgies? not at all, Whether they approved or were satisfied with every Thing in them? Even those, who compiled the First Liturgy of King *Edward*, were sensible of some Imperfections in it, but they were very glad, that without any Schism they had got the Reformation so far advanced; and never rested until they had thrown out all the Remains of Corruption, and made the Liturgy such as might please all Protestants, that were not too peevish and scrupulous.

Before the *Country-Man* proceeds to the Examination of the Second Argument, he attacks his Author, for denying, that the First *Book of Discipline* had any *Ecclesiastic* Authority. He himself owns, that it never had any *Civil* Authority: And as to the far greater Part of the leading *Nobility*, by whom, he says, it was subscribed, there were in all but Twenty Six, reckoning Noblemen and Gentlemen; and they refused to present it to the Parliament, if we may call by this Name, that *Convention* 1560, which had not been convoked by the Queen's Authority, nor afterwards confirmed and ratified

fied by her, and whose Acts were never printed amongst the other Acts of legal Parliaments. It is beyond all doubt, that the First Book of Discipline (t) was treated in ridicule, and called a Devout Imagination, which offended *Knox* exceedingly; yea, *Knox* tells us, pag. 319, that when it was moved in the Assembly, *Anno* 1561. that the Book should be offered to the Queen, and her Majesty should be supplicated to ratify it, the Motion was rejected, and the Question demanded, How many of those, that subscribed to that Book, would be subject to it? And *Lethington* said scoffingly, *Many subscribe there in fide parentum, as Children are baptised.* And if the Book of Discipline had been established by Ecclesiastical Authority, would it not appear from an expresse Act or Acts ratifying and confirming it? But none such are to be found. Nevertheless the *Country-Man* is at a Loss to understand, how it could enter into any Man's Head to deny, That it was Law-Ecclesiastical, for which he gives the following Reasons. " It
 " was compiled *Anno*, 1560. It was appointed
 " in the Assembly holden *June* and *July* 1562,
 " That Ministers be not removed from their
 " Kirks, but according to the Orders set down
 " in the *Book of Discipline*. In another Assembly,
 " in *December* that Year, the Superintendent of *Angus* was found fault with, for admitting young Men to be *Ministers* and *Exhorters* without Trial, which is required in
 P " the

(t) *Knox* p. 275, 276. *Spots.* p. 174.

“ the Book of Discipline; and *Bishops* and *Mini-*
 “ *sters*, not having entred by the Order appoin-
 “ ted in the Book of Discipline, are inhibited
 “ till farther Order. And the Assembly, in *June*
 “ and *July* 1562, would not admit *Mr. Adam*
 “ *Gordon* to his Charge of Superintendent, till
 “ he subscribed the Book of Discipline.” Now
 tho’ he is so positive as to affirm, That it is evi-
 dently beyond the Comprehension of Mortals,
 how the Book of Discipline cannot be Ecclesia-
 stical Law, as much as any Thing could be so;
 supposing the foresaid Acts: Yet I must beg
 Leave to tell him frankly, That if he would
 rely less upon his own Thoughts, and consult
 those, who may be supposed to understand some
 better what is necessary for making a Law; he
 would find, that the First Book of Discipline
 was never *Law*, notwithstanding those *Acts*
 which he hath cited. The most that can be in-
 ferred from them, is, That the Rules, for ad-
 mitting *Bishops* and Ministers, and for removing
 Ministers from their Kirks, received Authority
 of Ecclesiastical Laws from these Acts of
 Assemblies; and it is evident, they cannot be ex-
 tended farther. The Assembly 1562 might
 have had particular Reasons for requiring *Mr.*
Gordon to subscribe the Book of Discipline, with-
 out any general Law establishing and ratifying
 it. If the *British* Parliament, for special Rea-
 sons, should order the *Country-Man* to subscribe
 a Declaration, renouncing the Solemn League
 and Covenant; it would be a very unreasonable
 Infe-

Inference from thence, that they had made a general Law obliging all the Subjects to take that Declaration. Perhaps Mr. *Knox* and his Party, finding how much their Book of Discipline was ridicul'd and opposed, and that they durst not expressly confirm and ratify it, resolved to use their utmost Endeavours, that it might take place gradually; and therefore urged the Subscription to it. But whatever was their Design or Motive, and we are not obliged to account for all their Actions; it is certain nothing could make this Book Ecclesiastical Law, but an express Act of Assembly to that Effect; and I am sure the *Country-Man*, with the Assistance of all his Party, is not able to produce any.

We are at last led by him to the Consideration of the Second Enquiry, *viz. Whether it be true, that our Reformers in their Public Deeds openly and solemnly professed, That they were of one Communion with the Church of England? And whether the English Liturgy was once universally used in Scotland?* The *Country-Man* adds according to his Custom, *Whether it was used by our Reformers for Seven Years together?* But I shall show by and by, from the Words of his Adversary, that this does not precisely belong to the Question. His Argument drawn from his Account of our Reformers and the Book of Discipline, which he says, can never be answered, I have already sufficiently confuted. He undertakes to prove, That the *Liturgy of Geneva*

was used in *Scotland* before the Year 1564 as far
 back as 1557. And he begins with an Act of
 Assembly 1564, and another 1562, and the
 Book of Discipline compiled *Anno* 1560. To
 which the Author of the Charter has furnished
 us with a sufficient Answer pag. 99, 100. " We
 " find by the first Book of Discipline, that the
 " Order of *Geneva* was only coming in to be
 " used then, in some of the Churches *i. e.* 1560.
 " and it had nothing like a Public Establish-
 " ment, till the General Assembly holden at
 " *Edinburgh*, December 25. 1562. For then, and
 " not till then, it was concluded, *That an uni-*
 " *form Order should be kept in the Ministration of*
 " *the Sacraments, Solemnization of Marriages, and*
 " *Burial of the Dead, according to the Book of Ge-*
 " *neva*—It seems, this Act of the General
 " Assembly, December 1562. has not been strong
 " enough for turning out the *English* Liturgy,
 " and introducing the Form of *Geneva*: For
 " if we may believe *Calderwood* himself, the
 " General Assembly holden at *Edinburgh*, De-
 " cember 25. 1564. found themselves concerned
 " to make another Act, ordaining every *Mini-*
 " *ster, Exhorter and Reader*, to have one of the
 " *Psalms* Books, lately printed at *Edinburgh*, and
 " use the Order contained therein, in Prayers,
 " Marriage, and Administration of the Sacra-
 " ments. Where observe further, That Prayers
 " not mentioned in the Act 1562, are now put
 " in, from which it may be probably conjectu-
 " red, that, as much as *Knox* was against the
 " *English*

“ *English* Liturgy, he found many Difficulties
 “ to get it laid aside; so many, that it has not
 “ only been used by some (few or many, I can-
 “ not tell) in the Ministration of the Sacra-
 “ ments &c. after the Act 1562; but the
 “ Clergy have not found themselves obliged
 “ to forbear the Use of it in the Public Prayers,
 “ so that it was needful in this Assembly
 “ 1564 to make a new Act, restricting them
 “ both as to Prayers, and other Ministrations
 “ to the *Order of Geneva*. And if this holds,
 “ we have the *English* Liturgy, at least Seven
 “ Years in continued Practice in *Scotland*. But
 “ it is enough for my main Purpose, that it was
 “ once universally in use. ” But his Adversary
 asks, *Do the Acts themselves intimate, That the*
Design of them was to turn out the English Liturgy?
 I think indeed they do: The first Book of
 Discipline says expressly, *The Order of Geneva,*
which is now used in some of our Churches, i. e.
some of the Protestant Churches in Scotland;
 which plainly imports, that in others it was
 not used, *Anno 1560.* And I know no Church
 in the World at that Time, which had not
 some Liturgy or other; these therefore who
 used not the *Geneva* Form, must necessarily have
 had the *English*. Again in the Act 1562, Mi-
 nistration of the Sacraments, solemnizing of
 Marriages and Burial of the Dead, are only
 confined to the Book of *Geneva*; and then at
 last by the Act 1564, the Prayers are also ap-
 pointed to be according to that Liturgy. Whence
 it

it seems plain to me, that the very Acts discover the Occasion and Design. I will not contend with him, whether the Common Prayers, mentioned in the Book of Discipline, were the *Genevan* Prayers; tho' I am sure none of the Arguments he hath brought, do prove it: Nevertheless I must put him in Mind, that I have shown, that this Book had no Authority, no not Ecclesiastical; and supposing I should grant it had, yet, it does not follow, that by vertue of an Ecclesiastic Sanction every Article took Effect, and was reduced to Practice. I could prove the contrary by several Instances.

The *Country-Man* goes on to prove, That the *Genevan* Form obtained in *Scotland* even before 1560, which he does by two Assertions of *Calderwood*; but being sensible, that his Authority would signify little, considering how much he is thought to be byassed, and that his Partiality has been clearly discovered by our learned Author and others, he has therefore thought fit to confirm his bare Assertions with some Reasons of so little Force, that he had done better, in my Opinion, to have suffered the Testimonies to shift for themselves. And First, he says, We have no Reason to doubt of *Calderwood's* two Assertions, because our Reformers, at the compiling of the Book of Discipline, Anno 1560, found the *Genevan Liturgy* in Use; for thus their Words run, *And albeit the Order of Geneva, which is now used in some of our Churches, is sufficient to instruct the diligent Reader,*

der, how that both the Sacraments may be rightly ministred; yet for an Uniformity to be kept, we thought good to add this as superabundant, &c. Now the Author of the Charter, and every Body else but the Country-Man would think, that the Words cannot be meant but of the Protestant Churches, and consequently that the Order of Geneva was but then coming in; since they say, it was then used in some of their Churches. But let him alone: For he has a very dexterous Faculty of avoiding the greatest Difficulties; and can very nimbly change in a Moment *Some* into *All*, as appears from the following Speech: " And whereas in the above Words 'tis said, That the Order of Geneva at that Time was used only in some of our Churches, which intimates, that it was not used in *all*, the Reason is obvious: For *all* as yet had not embraced the Reformation, nor was it, according to your Author's Calculation, established by Law. " This is such Trifling, (not to say worse) that it would be an Injury to the Reader, if I should spend more Words upon it.

I shall therefore pass to his other two Arguments, which, if he had thought fit, might have been put into one. " 2do. (saith he) " The Prayers against the French Men are yet extant in our Scots Liturgy; and these were made before the Year 1560. 3tio. 'Tis plain, that in the Year 1559, the Scots and English Common-Prayers were different; for
" in

“ in the Letter written by Secretary Cecil we
 “ have these Words, *It should much help, in our*
 “ *Opinion, if the Preachers both in Persuasion and*
 “ *in Public Prayers, as ours do here, would com-*
 “ *mend the same to the People.* ” But no Body
 denies, that the Scots used Public Prayers against
 the French, for which the English had no Use,
 and these Prayers were insert into Knox's Li-
 turgy afterwards. Nothing is more ordinary,
 than for the Church of England to appoint
 Prayers for particular Occasions adapted to
 their own Circumstances, which yet would be
 improper for others that use their Liturgy. Let
 us suppose, that those of the Episcopal Clergy
 in Scotland, who used the English Liturgy, had
 some Years ago used in their Public Devotions
 a Prayer for Deliverance from the Persecution
 of the Presbyterians; would this be a good
 Argument, that they did not perform Divine
 Worship by the Liturgy, because they had
 used a Prayer peculiar to their own Circum-
 stances, which did not take Place in England?
 One Egg is not liker to another than this Way
 of Reasoning is to the Country-Man's.

The Country-Man goes on and adds, “ But
 “ why do I speak of the Scots Liturgy, its being
 “ in Use in the Year 1559, 'tis certain the Book
 “ of the Order of Geneva was in English Five
 “ or Six Years before that. ” We shall sup-
 pose this, tho' I could prove the contrary, and
 what then? “ Knox came to Scotland Anno
 “ 1555. Is it not probable, that he brought
 “ that

“ that *Liturgy* along with him ; and *Calderwood* tells us, He ministred the L O R D’s Supper after that Form. ” We shall suppose this : What follows ? “ Is it not probable, that a Man of his Influence, would engage others to follow the same Form ? He must be a great Stranger to *Knox’s* Character that doubts it. ” *Knox* indeed was of a warm and active Temper, but one or two Copies could never have served his Design, which are all can be supposed he could have brought with him, his own Circumstances then, as well as the State of Affairs at that Time, being considered. Neither was his Stay so long, as could be sufficient for making so great a Change in the Worship. And thus I have briefly examined the Arguments by which, he thinks, the *Scotish* Liturgy is clearly proved to have had Possession in *Scotland*. The Vanity and Weakness of which will be most evident to all that are impartial and unprejudiced from the public Deeds of our *Reformers*, to the Consideration of which we are now led by the *Country-Man’s* Method.

And we begin with the very first public Step towards our Reformation, made by the Lords of the Congregation, *December 3, 1557*, appointing the *English Liturgy* to be used. *Knox* gives us the Ordinance in these Words : *The Lords and Barons, professing Christ Jesus, convened frequently in Council, in the which these Heads were concluded. First it is thought expedient, advised and ordained, That, in all Parishes within*

Q

this

this Realm, the Common Prayer be read, weekly on Sunday or other Festival Days, publicly in the Parish Churches, with the Lessons of the Old and New Testament, conformable to the Book of Common Prayers; and if the Curates of the Parishes be qualified, that they read the same; and if they be not or refuse, that the most qualified in the Parish use and read the same. Spotswood and Petrie give the same Account. Calderwood omits only the Mention of other *Festival Days* besides *Sundays*, lest it should make against the *Presbyterian Interest*. The excellent Author of the *Charter* foreseeing, that the only possible Evasion would be, that it is not said by any of the Historians, that it was the Book of the Common Prayers of the Church of *England*, has been at the Trouble to prove it, by such Arguments as cannot but convince all that are unbyassed. For thus he argues, “ It was either the Book of Common
 “ Prayers of the Church of *England*, or the *Genevan* Liturgy; for we no where read of a
 “ Third, ever pretended to have been used in
 “ those Times in *Scotland*: Now that is was
 “ not the Liturgy of *Geneva* is plain; for besides
 “ that it is utterly incredible, that there could
 “ have been so many Copies of the *Genevan*
 “ Form in the Vulgar Language, then in *Scotland*, as might serve so many Churches; nay
 “ that it is highly probable, there was not so
 “ much as one. Besides this, I say, in the *Genevan* Form, which was afterwards used in
 “ *Scotland*, there is no Order for, no Footstep
 “ of,

“ of, the Observation of other Holy Days, besides
 “ *Sundays*; neither is there any Order in it for
 “ reading of *Lessons* of the *Old and New Testa-*
 “ *ment*, except in the *Treatise of Fasting*, which
 “ was not compiled till the Year 1565. There,
 “ indeed, *Lessons* are appointed, such and such
 “ *Psalms*, and such and such *Histories* in the *Old*,
 “ but not so much as one Title of the *New Te-*
 “ *stament*. In all the rest of the Book there is
 “ deep Silence about *Lessons*; than which there
 “ cannot be a clearer Demonstration, that the
 “ Book appointed to be used in *December* 1557
 “ was not that of *Geneva*. ” One would think,
 this drove the Nail to the Head: But a Mathe-
 matical Demonstration it self shall not be Proof
 against the *Country-Man*. He begins his At-
 tacque after a surprizing Manner; he'll, for-
 sooth, out of pure good Nature, for once grant
 the very Thing in Question, *viz.* That the
 Common Prayers mentioned in the said Ordi-
 nance, were the *English* Common Prayers;
 and yet he affirms, that the said Ordinance will
 not prove our Author's Assertions, tho' it had
 been so. Strange! If the Prayers of the Church
 of *England* were ordered to be read in all the
 Churches upon all *Sundays* and other *Holy Days*,
 then they were ordered to be read, which is the
 only Thing we wanted to be proved by this
 Public Deed. Ay, but the *Country-Man* will
 say, ye are far mistaken, I am not so liberal as
 ye fancied: I meant not to grant you the whole
Liturgy, but only the *Matines* and *Even-Song*,

and these too wanting the *Absolution*, being not above a Twentieth Part of the Liturgy ; and the Ordinance it self obliges me to no more, which I prove thus. These *English* Prayers are only ordained to be read, which a Lay-Man may lawfully read, incase of the Curate's Refusal ; but Morning and Evening Prayers without the Absolution can only be read by Lay-Men. But I must tell him, that he is not so well acquainted with the Liturgy as he fancies. In a Case of Necessity, there is nothing to hinder a Lay-Man from reading all that Part of the Communion-Service, which is used when the Sacrament is not given. There is nothing in the Visitation of the Sick, except the Absolution ; nor in the Office for Burial, which he may not lawfully read : And if we take in the *Psalter* into the Computation, he had been more in the Right to have said, That Lay-Men, incase of Necessity, are excluded from not above the 20th Part of the Liturgy. He has another Reason to prove, That, by this Ordinance, no more could be meant but Evening and Morning Prayers. *Uninstituted Ceremonies was one of the earliest Controversies that was started among the Reformed ; as appears from the former Account of Knox, Seton, &c. And these same Reformers, who made the above Ordinance, gave in, next Year, a Protestation to the Parliament with some Demands, and particularly, That they might not incur Danger for violating such Rites, as Man without GOD's Commandment or Word, hath commanded ;*
there-

therefore the Offices, in which these uninstituted Ceremonies are enjoined, are excluded from the Common Prayers in the Ordinance. But it is plain, he infers too much, even supposing what he affirms concerning our Reformers, was literally true in his Sense. All that could follow from thence, would be, that *Crossing* was omitted in the Office of *Baptism*; and the *Ring* in that of *Matrimony*; which might easily be done, by omitting only one Sentence in each Office, and by sitting at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, not one Syllable is altered in the Liturgy. But I have often told him, that those general Propositions of some of our Reformers, such as that of *Seton*, *That the Law GOD is the only Rule of Righteousness* &c. are to be understood in a qualified Sense, and they meant no more by them, than that Nothing is to be owned as necessary Parts of the Sacraments, and essential to Worship, but what is instituted by Christ. If the *Country-Man* extend them further, he may give another Instance of his good Nature, by making another advantageous Concession to us, which yet, by his Way of Reasoning, may do us no Good at all. *e. g.* I will for once (saith the *Country-Man*) grant to you that other Holy Days, besides *Sunday*, are authorised by this Ordinance; yet I shall prove the Observation of these Holy Days is not enjoined by it. These very Lords and Barons demanded from the Parliament, that they might not incur Danger for Rites that are not commanded by GOD,
and

and our Reformers were against every Thing in Religion, that was not of Divine Institution. Therefore Holy Days, except *Sunday*, are not enjoined to be observed by this Ordinance. But what need I multiply Words upon this Head? Upon the Supposition, that by the Prayers are meant the *English* Prayers, it is impossible to put any other Sense upon the Ordinance but this, That the Liturgy of *England* was to be read publicly in the Parish Churches; and if the Curates refused, then any qualified Lay-Man might read so much of it, as could be lawfully read by him. The *Country-Man's* Sense is so ridiculous, that I am content to refer that Controversy to an Arbitration; and one of his own dearest and nearest Friends shall be the Judge, whom he cannot suspect or refuse with any Shadow of Justice. Let the Arbiter then be the Author of the *Country-Man's Letter to the Curate*, who P. 62. determined the Case positively in my Favour. *Now he were* (saith he) *senseless even to a Prodigy, that should dream, that our Reformers had ordained the English Liturgy to be used for the Common Prayers, and the Scots Liturgy in all the other Parts.* I will not use his own Language P. 79. when he fancied, and that without any Reason, that his Adversary had contradicted himself. "Had your Author lost his Wits or his Memory? Had he forgot what he had wrote, P. 85? No indeed; but he hoped his Reader had, and that would serve his Turn as well." Whatever may be

be lawful to the *Country-Man* I would think my self guilty of Rashness, by following his Example. If the *Country-Man* be offended that the Arbiter has condemned him as senseless to a Prodigy, he can blame no Body but his own dear and ingenious Self for it.

It is now high Time to consider his other Argument, by which he would prove, That supposing the *English* Prayers were meant, yet that could not prove our Author's Assertions; and it is this: *The Ordinance did not then universally take Place, very few Parts of the Nation had then set up the Reformation.* Spotswood tells us, *That it obtained only in these Parts, wherein these reforming Lords had Power, and in some other Towns and Parishes by their Example.* But tell me in good Earnest, honest *Country-Man*, do ye truly think, that our Author, when he said, That the *English* Liturgy was once universally used in *Scotland*, meant, that it was the Form of Worship, which obtained not only in the Protestant Congregations, but even in the *Chapel-Royal*, the *Bishop's Cathedrals*, and in a Word, in all the *Popish Churches* themselves throughout the Kingdom? GOD have Mercy upon your poor Family, if ye thus wrest and pervert the Sacred Scriptures, at your Evening Exercise. It is enough for our Author's Purpose, if the Ordinance took Effect in all the Reformed *Congregations* of the Kingdom; and the *Country-Man* has not offered the Shadow of a Proof to the contrary; unless he think

think that to be one, which he subjoins immediately from *Spotiswood*. The Reformed found a Necessity, well nigh a Year afterward, notwithstanding the said Ordinance, of Petitioning the Regent, that in conceiving the Public Prayers, and in the Administration of the Sacraments, they might use the Vulgar Language understood by the People. It is plain, that Nothing more or less can be understood here, than that the Reformed was desirous to obtain Allowance, from the Civil Authority, to perform their Worship in the Vulgar Language, because their Ordinance was no Law, and consequently could not save them from being obnoxious to their Enemies. But perhaps the Country-Man intends to prove from the Words of the Petition, that they used no Set-Forms at all, but only conceived Prayers in their Public Worship; that which makes me suspect, he would fain cunningly insinuate this, tho' he dare not speak it out, is, that he hath put the Words *in conceiving* in Capital Letters; so that some extraordinary Emphasis or other must ly there; and what else it may be, I cannot guess. If I have hit upon his Intention, then let us see, what the Meaning of the Ordinance must be. Why truly, it was even this. It is ordained, That in all Parishes, the Common-Prayer, by which we mean, neither the *English Liturgy*, nor that of *Geneva*, but only conceived Prayers, be read weekly upon Sunday and other Festival-Days, with the Lessons of the Old and New

Testa-

Testament, conformable to the Book of Common Prayers.

And thus I have considered his Grant, which I allow him now to resume, and to try how he can prove, That the Book of Common Prayers in the Ordinance was the *Genevan* Liturgy, and not the *English*. This he attempts to do by Two demonstrative Arguments. The First of which is: *The Scots were not under the English Influence at this Time; for Queen Mary was upon the Throne of England, and the Liturgy was thrown out by Act of Parliament: What Inducement then had the Scots to embrace it?* It is very true, the Author of the Charter has evidently shown, that our Reformation under G O D was principally cherished by the *English* Influences; and inferred from thence, That we reformed upon the same Principles; and what should hinder the same Argument to take Place here? Tho' Queen *Mary* and her Ministry opposed the Reformation and the Liturgy, yet that did not destroy the Effects of the happy Influences of her Father and Brother; upon the Reformation in *Scotland*. Yea, the Persecution it self by Queen *Mary*, which Men thought would have utterly extinguished the Reformed Religion, by the Providence of G O D was made a Means to advance it among us; for some, who had fled from the Storm in *England*, taking their Refuge in this Kingdom, did not only help to preserve the Light, which had begun to shine, but made the Sun to break up more clear

clear than before (a). I think it very probable, that the *English* Liturgy had been used in *Scotland*, before this *Ordinance* was made, and the *Ordinance* it self seems to infer it; else how or whence could so many Copies of the Liturgy be got so suddenly? It is soon enough to see a Public Order establishing the Liturgy, when first our Reformers had the Boldness to make public Steps towards the *Reformation*; which now they did, notwithstanding *Mary* was upon the Throne of *England*: And therefore the *Country-Man's* substantial Argument, as he calls it, can be of no Force at all.

His Second Argument does not a whit mend the Matter. *About the Time that the Reforming Lords made the Ordinance, they wrote Letters to Knox, inviting him Home to carry on the Reformation: Now the authorising of the English Liturgy would have quite scarr'd him from accepting the Invitation; therefore the Common Prayers in the Ordinance are not the English but those of Geneva.* One, by this way of arguing, might prove, That the *Ordinance* does not approve the Observation of Holy-Days; tho' the contrary is evident; and the *Country-Man* himself owns (b) 'Tis more than probable, that till 1560 they had been observed in *Scotland* by the Reformed. *Knox*, as appears from the First Book of Discipline, thought the Observation of Holy-Days superstitious; therefore the Lords did not approve them by their *Ordinance*, or, if they did it, they could

(a) *Spotf.* p. 92. *Knox.* p. 98. (b) p. 71.

could not write to him an Invitation to return, or at least, if they had the Confidence to write, it must been after this Manner. *Pray, good Mr. Knox, come over and help us to advance the Reformation, and for your Encouragement, you shall find those Superstitious Days Christmase, Easter, &c. most religiously observed by us, against which you preached in Scotland, against which you declared in Council in England &c.* Sure I am, he declared in Council as much against them as the Liturgy; for one may read the whole Liturgy, tho' he think kneeling at the *Eucharist Man's Invention*: But Mr. Knox was a better Man than to be scarr'd, from so good a Work, by that Liturgy, in which he had joined so often himself; and if he was of the Temper, the *Country-Man* would have him, it had been happy for our Reformers and their Posterity, that they had never seen his Face.

Having thus discussed the *Country-Man's* Arguments, by which he endeavours to convince us, that nothing was meant by the Common-Prayers but the Order of *Geneva*, I shall next examine his Answers to our Author's Reasoning, which, notwithstanding the *Country Man's* Shifts and Evasions, I yet believe to be a full and plain Demonstration, that the Common-Prayers, ordained by the *Lords of the Congregation*, to be read in the Parish Churches, were the Prayers of the *English Liturgy*. And First the *Country-Man* asks, *What should make it incredible or improbable, that there could have been*

so many Copies of the Genevan Form in the Vulgar Language, then in Scotland, as might serve so many Parish Churches? He says, " It was
 " in Print and in *English* three Years and a
 " Quarter before this Ordinance; and *Knox*
 " took a Trip to *Scotland*, Anno 1555. Is it
 " either incredible or improbable (*saith he*)
 " that he would bring a Copy with him? Sup-
 " pose he had not come, is it incredible or im-
 " probable, that he would have sent a Copy?
 " Dr. *Burnet* tells us, The Protestants, that fled
 " from Queen *Mary's* Persecution, took Care to
 " send over many Books from *Germany*, for
 " the Instruction and Comfort of their Friends
 " at Home; would *Knox* be the only careless
 " Man? Is it improbable, the *Geneva-Liturgy*
 " would be one of these Books? Was your
 " Author advised, that the Copy was lost at
 " Sea? Or, that being come to *England*, it
 " could not be transmitted to *Scotland*? Or,
 " that being come thither, no Body would be
 " so careful or curious, as to cast off an Im-
 " pression of it? Sir, I think it highly cre-
 " dible, there were more Copies of that Book,
 " than Churches in the Possession of the Re-
 " formed, at that Time; for by any thing, I
 " have observed, they were not in Possession
 " of so much as one Church. " Many Things
 might be justly excepted against, in this florid
 Speech. As for Example, it may be very rea-
 sonably doubted, whether *Knox* brought or
 sent a Copy. The scandalous Effects of his vi-
 olent

olent and unseasonable Zeal at *Francfort* might have taught him more Prudence and Moderation. Tho' the *Genevan Liturgy* had been printed as soon as the *Country-Man* would have it; yet according to his own Chronology, the *English Liturgy*, even *Edward VI's* Second, was published and read in all the Churches of *England* some Years before *Knox* took his Trip into *Scotland*, yea, before he went to *Francfort*, who can doubt, but the Reformed in *Scotland*, would use all their Endeavours to provide themselves with Copies, especially when for a considerable Time there was no other Liturgy in their own Language: And the unaccountable Presbyterian Principle of rejecting Liturgies, was so far from the Thoughts of the Protestants at that Time, that we had a Liturgy without Interruption, even until the horrid Rebellion against the Glorious Martyr *Charles I.* as the *Country-Man* acknowledges? Neither was there any Difficulty in furnishing themselves with a greater Number of Books than they wanted, there was no Scarcity of Copies, the Church of *England* desired nothing more ardently, than that their Religion and Worship should be propagated, especially into *Scotland*, whose Friendship they studied by all Means to gain. And one had no more to do, but to slip over the Border, and fill his Pockets with Books, and be without all Fear or Hazard of being discovered. Whereas on the other Hand, there was but one *English* Edition of

of the *Geneva-Liturgy* in *English*, and that not till a Year or more after *Edward's* Death. And considering how many were to be used at *Frankfort*, or rather *Geneva*, to which Place they were forced to retire, there would be few Copies could be spared to be sent into *England*, and of those that were brought thither and escaped the Search of the Papists, the most would be kept in *England*, and few would have hazarded to carry them so far as *Scotland*. If then *Scotland* was so well provided with Copies of the *English* Liturgy, purged from all the Remains of Popery, being the same in all the main Parts with that which is at this Day used in *England*, as the *Country-Man* owns ; Is it probable or credible, that any Wise or Good Man would be at the Pains to bring or send Books, that could be of no good Use, at least, in the present Circumstances, and could serve no other End, but to raise Jealousies, Disturbances and Factions amongst persecuted People, who wanted rather Books for confirming them in the Truth, and opening the Eyes of those who still continued to embrace the old Corruptions in Doctrine and Worship? Those, who represent Mr. *Knox* as making this his chief Study and Aim, do no small Hurt to the Memory and Reputation of that famous Reformer : They might as well say, That he had not the least Degree of common Prudence, that he was a *Boutefeu* and Incendiary, and preferred the Advancement of his own singular Conceits

ceits and Whims to the Propagation of pure Religion and Truth. Notwithstanding all that has been said, yet to oblige the *Country-Man*, I shall suppose that *Knox* sent or brought a few Copies to *Scotland*; but how will he be able to multiply them so, that, in the Year 1557, they were sufficient to serve all the Parish Churches and Reformed over the whole Kingdom? The *Country-Man* indeed is very dexterous in finding out Expedients, and he can overcome with all Ease much greater Difficulties. Why, *being once brought to Scotland some careful or curious Person would not fail to cast off an Impression*. But, I hope, his careful and curious Person must have been a Printer: And how many *Printers*, does he think, we had in *Scotland* at that Time? It is very fair, if we allow Two or Three, and these also were wholly in the opposite Interest, depended intirely on the Court and Popish Clergy, and could expect no other Reward for their Care and Curiosity, but Fire and Fagots without Mercy; for they being so few and and well known, they could not possibly be concealed.

But if this Method will not do the Business, he has yet another Way to rid himself of the Difficulty. *There were moe Copies of the Genevan Liturgy than Churches, in the Possession of the Reformed at that Time; for by any Thing he hath observed, they were not in Possession of so much as one Church*. I pity the poor Ordinance, it has put him so much out of Humour, that he'll never be
at

of the *Geneva-Liturgy* in *English*, and that not till a Year or more after *Edward's* Death. And considering how many were to be used at *Frankfort*, or rather *Geneva*, to which Place they were forced to retire, there would be few Copies could be spared to be sent into *England*, and of those that were brought thither and escaped the Search of the Papists, the most would be kept in *England*, and few would have hazarded to carry them so far as *Scotland*. If then *Scotland* was so well provided with Copies of the *English* Liturgy, purged from all the Remains of Popery, being the same in all the main Parts with that which is at this Day used in *England*, as the *Country-Man* owns; Is it probable or credible, that any Wise or Good Man would be at the Pains to bring or send Books, that could be of no good Use, at least, in the present Circumstances, and could serve no other End, but to raise Jealousies, Disturbances and Factions amongst persecuted People, who wanted rather Books for confirming them in the Truth, and opening the Eyes of those who still continued to embrace the old Corruptions in Doctrine and Worship? Those, who represent Mr. *Knox* as making this his chief Study and Aim, do no small Hurt to the Memory and Reputation of that famous Reformer: They might as well say, That he had not the least Degree of common Prudence, that he was a *Boutefeu* and Incendiary, and preferred the Advancement of his own singular Conceits

ceits and Whims to the Propagation of pure Religion and Truth. Notwithstanding all that has been said, yet to oblige the *Country-Man*, I shall suppose that *Knox* sent or brought a few Copies to *Scotland*; but how will he be able to multiply them so, that, in the Year 1557, they were sufficient to serve all the Parish Churches and Reformed over the whole Kingdom? The *Country-Man* indeed is very dexterous in finding out Expedients, and he can overcome with all Ease much greater Difficulties. Why, *being once brought to Scotland some careful or curious Person would not fail to cast off an Impression*. But, I hope, his careful and curious Person must have been a Printer: And how many *Printers*, does he think, we had in *Scotland* at that Time? It is very fair, if we allow Two or Three, and these also were wholly in the opposite Interest, depended intirely on the Court and Popish Clergy, and could expect no other Reward for their Care and Curiosity, but Fire and Fagots without Mercy; for they being so few and and well known, they could not possibly be concealed.

But if this Method will not do the Business, he has yet another Way to rid himself of the Difficulty. *There were moe Copies of the Genevan Liturgy than Churches, in the Possession of the Reformed at that Time; for by any Thing he hath observed, they were not in Possession of so much as one Church*. I pity the poor Ordinance, it has put him so much out of Humour, that he'll never be
at

at Peace until he has made it downright Nonsense. It is strange, that this last Thought of his did not necessarily lead him to a short and most effectual Way of being delivered for ever from its Noise and Trouble, and that also agreeable to one of the most ordinary and approved Laws of *Criticism*. He had no more to do, but to affirm, with his usual Confidence and Assurance, *That it is a spurious Act and a meer Forgery, contrived by an Impostor afterwards, who was altogether ignorant of those Times, who obtrudes a pretended Act, whereby is insinuated, that the Reformed had possessed themselves of some Churches, and were in Hopes of obtaining the rest, and yet it is certain, that they were not in Possession of one within the Kingdom at that Time.* I indeed hate all Wrangling, and therefore will not contend about what is altogether unnecessary. Let us then suppose, that there was no Church at that Time possessed by the Protestants in *Scotland*, and if he mean Legal Possession, perhaps there will be no Doubt about it: But I would fain ask him, Were there no Protestant Congregations or Families in the Kingdom in the Year 1557? If there were, and so many as could not possibly be served by Two or Three Books brought or sent by Mr. *Knox*, then all that the *Country-Man* has said upon this Subject, is idle and to no Purpose.

Proceed we now to consider his Answer to this Part of the *Reasoning*. In the *Genevan Form* that was afterwards used in *Scotland*, there

is no Order for, no Footstep of, the Observation of other Holy-Days, besides Sunday. One would think, if this be true, it is impossible the Book of Common Prayers, in the Ordinance, could be the Liturgy of Geneva. Let us then see, what the Country-Man says to it. " In all the Impressions
 " of the *Genevan* Liturgy that ever I saw, there
 " is a Table for the *Moveable Feasts*, and besides that, a Kalendar, and one of the Columns
 " bears the Title of Festival Days; and in that
 " Column the same Feasts and the same Saints
 " are marked as in *K. Edward's* Kalendar. Here
 " is a pretty lively Footstep of the Observation
 " of Holy-Days; and I cannot but pity your Author's Eye-Sight, that he could not see this". But by his Leave, tho' in all the Kalendars prefixed to the *Scotish Genevan* Liturgy, we have some Festival and Saints Days marked; yet they are not, in several Editions, the same with those of *Edward's* Kalendar: Neither is the Kalendar a Footstep, far less a pretty lively Footstep of the Observation of Holy Days. The chief Use of one Column of the Kalendar in the *English* Liturgy is to show the Days on which fall the Feasts and Fasts of the Church; yet it has other Uses also, since several Saints are yet retained in their Kalendar, whose Days they do not solemnize. Certainly the Printer, either by himself, or with Advice, hath added the Kalendar to the old *Scotish* Liturgy, upon a Civil Account; because it was necessary for Contracts and all Matters of Business and Commerce.

merce. *Whitsunday, Lammas, Martinmas* and *Candlemas* were our ordinary *Terms*. Do not the Country-People, even to this Day, for the most Part use the Stile of the Kalendar? And about the Time that the Order of *Geneva* was introduced, that Language was so necessary, that one could scarcely understand his Neighbour's without it. And this was the only Reason, why the Kalendar was prefixed to *Knox's* Liturgy: It was instead of an *Almanack*; and was not placed there upon any Religious Account. Those of *Geneva*, from whom our old Liturgy was borrowed, had never any Kalendar printed with their Book, nor had they any in *France*, where it was also used. The Church of *Geneva*, as well as all other Churches in the World, ancient or modern, except our pure Kirk of *Scotland*, had always and still have other Holy Days, besides *Sunday*, which they observe religiously: But the Festivals of *Geneva* are so few, that they want no Kalendar for them. It is plain then, that the Kalendar alone cannot be any Evidence, that Festivals were observed in the Church of *Scotland*, which I shall further confirm by the following Argument.

The Observation of Holy Days is condemned as superstitious by the *First Book of Discipline*, and it is most certain, that they were not observed in *Scotland* for many Years; and yet all that Time the Kalendar, with the Names of the *Apostolic Saints* and others, continued still in the old *Scottish* Liturgy. Now was the Kalendar at that
Time

Time a Proof or a pretty lively Footstep of the Observation of Holy Days? I think, he dare not say it: If it could not be an Argument then, let him give me a Reason, why at any other Time it could be such. It must therefore have been put in and continued upon the same, that is a Civil Account. And it was of very good Use for showing the Fairs, which made the *English Officer*, who wrote the *Short Account of Scotland*, &c. *London 1702*, to say, *That the Kalendar was designed more for the Use of the Fairs than anything else.* The *Country-Man* endeavours to confute this, and offers a Guess at the Occasion of his Mistake: But if he had been as well acquainted with the Editions of *Knox's Liturgy*, as he pretends, he might have found, that the Stranger was much in the Right. I shall mention only the Edition of the *Psalms and Prayers, &c.* printed at *Edinburgh* by *Henry Charteris*, *Anno 1596*, when *Scotish Presbytery* was rampant; the very Year, in which *Mr. David Blake*, Minister of *St. Andrew's* (x), uttered in a Sermon diverse Speeches full of Spight against the King, the Queen, and the Lords of Council and Session; and called the Queen of *England* an *Atheist*, a Woman of no Religion; and by the Advice of *Mr. Andrew Melvil* and the other *Brethren* (y), declined the King and his Council as Judges; the very Year, in which (z) the Ministers raised a terrible Rabble against the King and his Counsellors, who were in the greatest Hazard

S 2

of

(x) *Spotsf.* P. 419. (y) P. 421. (z) P. 427, 428.

of their Lives from the Fury of the Mob ; and the same Year when Mr. *John Welch* durst say (a), in a Sermon, *That the King was possessed with a Devil*, &c. An Almanack (or if the Country-Man will have it so, a Kalendar) is prefixed to that Edition of *Knox's* Liturgy, but nothing like the Kalendar of *Edward VI.* which continued the same in all the Editions of the *English* Liturgy before the Restauration, except as to the *Lessons*. The First Page contains a Table of the Moveable Feasts, Golden Number, &c. with this Title, *Ane Almanack for the Space of 30 Zeiris*, unless this be the Title designed for the whole ; for it has none other at the Head of the following Pages, we have the Name of each Month with 4 Lines of Rhime, such as are in the ordinary Almanacks : v. g. *January, Gif thou be seik and helth wald haif, The Counsel of the Lernit craif*, &c. It consists of 5 Columns, the first contains the Rising of the Sun ; the 2d, the Dominical Letters ; the 3d, the Days of the Month ; the 4th, the Festival and Saints Days, the Fairs and several remarkable Events, with the Sign of the *Zodiac* into which the Sun enters ; and the 5th, the Setting of the Sun ; and in the last Page we have, *The Use of the Epact to know the Age of the Moon*, &c. Now tho' it be most certain, that no Holy Days, except *Sunday*, were observed at that Time by the Kirk of *Scotland*, yet we have in that Almanack all the Feasts observed by the Church of *England* ; and con-

fe-

sequently this can be no Footstep of the Observation of them in *Scotland*: Yea we have those of them, on which there were no Fairs at that Time, as *Circumcision*, *Conversion of St. Paul*, *Purification of Mary*, *Matthew*, *Philip* and *Jacob*, *Simon* and *Jude*, *Thomas*, *Tule-Day*, *Steven*, *John Evang.* *Innocents-Day*. And besides the Festivals of the Church of *England*, we have no Saints Days, except those, on which there were Fairs in some Place of *Scotland*, v.g. *January 13. S. Mungo's Day in Glasgow a Fair*, *March 17. S. Patrick's Day in Dumbartoun a Fair*, &c. The *Country-Man* asks, In what Part of *Scotland* is the *Circumcision* or *Epiphany-Fair* kept? The Answer is plain, There were no Fairs on those Days, *Anno 1596*: Yet, if he pleases, he may see in that Kalendar, *S. Barnabie's Fair in Lauder*, *S. James's Day in Couper of Fife*, *in Lanerk*, and *in Old Roxburgh, a Fair*. *Bartholomew's Day in Linlithgow a Fair*, *S. John's Day in S. Johnstoun a Fair*, &c. From all which it is plain, that the *Country-Man* only, and not the *English Gentleman*, has been mistaken; and that the Kalendar was not prefixed to *Knox's Liturgy* upon any Religious Account, and therefore cannot be a Proof of the Observation of the Holy Days in the then Church of *Scotland*.

I cannot here neglect to take Notice of a most intolerable Omission which the *Country-Man* has been guilty of, and yet, I must confess, he was very Wise to take that Course. It is very

very hard to touch Hot Coals, and not to burn our Fingers. He has wholly passed over the most substantial Part of the Argument, without speaking one Word about it. The Author's Reasoning was, *That in the Geneva-Form there is no Order for, no Footstep of, the Observation of Holy Days.* Now, suppose the Kalendar were a sufficient Proof of the Observation of Holy Days, yet where is the Order for observing these and no other Days as Festivals. The Kalendar can never determine this, seeing it contains a great Number of *Saints Days*, which are not observed in the Church of *England* it self; and therefore that Church gives particular *Tables* determining the *Vigils, Feasts* and Days of *Fasting*, which are to be kept by those of her Communion. Now it is impossible to show me in the *Genevan* Liturgy, in any Language, *French, Latin* or *English*, the least Footstep of any Order for observing Holy Days, far less determining what those Holy Days were: And yet this is necessarily contained in the Ordinance; for it is there ordained, *That Common Prayer should be read on Sunday and other Festival Days, with the Lessons, conformable to the Book of Common Prayers.* As they therefore could not know, what *Lessons* were to be read but by the Book of Common Prayers, so they could only know the Festivals, on which they were to assemble, from the same Book. Seeing therefore no such Thing is determined in the Order of *Geneva*, it follows undeniably, that the Book
of

of Common-Prayers in the Ordinance was the Liturgy of the Church of England.

The last Point of the Demonstration was this, *Neither is there any Order in the Book of Geneva for reading of Lessons of the Old and New Testament, except in the Treatise of Fasting, which was not compiled till the Year 1565. There indeed Lessons are appointed, such and such Places, and such and such Histories in the Old, but not so much as one Title of the New Testament. In all the rest of the Book there is a deep Silence about Lessons ; than which there cannot be a clearer Demonstration, that the Book appointed to be read, December 1557, was not the Book of Geneva.* I confess, I am one of those, whose Affection is stronger than their Judgment ; if that Censure of the *Country-Man* must fall upon all, who believe that this is a clear and certain Proof, and therefore a Demonstration of what I intended. The *Country-Man* affirms in the First Place, That these Lessons will not infer, That they were the *English* Common Prayers, or Liturgy was meant in the Ordinance. Why, Sir, I pray you ? Because, *imo.* “ If that Ordinance “ had designed the Introduction of the *English* “ Liturgy, it would have appointed the Lessons “ not only to be read on *Sundays* and Festival “ Days, but every Day throughout the Year. ” A noble Reason indeed ! If ye would take my Advice, for ye would content your self with flily skipping over what does not please you, and manfully affirming what can do you Service ;

vice ; for it is a hard and troublesome Business to prove every rash Word, that a Body is forc'd to at a Pinch. Is it insinuated in the Ordinance, that the Book of Common Prayers did appoint no Lessons for every Day throughout the Year, If it had done this, then certainly that Book could not have been the *English* Liturgy : But there is no such thing to be found there. What can the *Country-Man* mean by this his Reason? Would he have had the Lords to ordain the *Lessons* for all the other Days of the Year, to be read on the *Sundays* and Holy-Days, besides their own Lessons? That was not possible to be done. Whoever considers the Circumstances of the Reformed at that Time, will think it was very much, that they could assemble themselves together for Public Worship so often. In the present afflicted State of our Church, tho' (blessed be G O D) we have, in some Towns, the *Prayers* and *Lessons* read not only on *Sundays* and *Holy-Days*, but also on all the *Litany* Days throughout the Year, yet in the Country Parishes they have not Public Worship so often. Let us then suppose, That our spiritual *Fathers* wrote to the *Country-Prefbyters*, That it were fit, the *Prayers* and *Lessons* should be read according to the Common Prayer in their Congregations, not only on the *Sundays*, but all the other Holy-Days also: Would any Body of Sense infer from that Order a Hundred Years after this, that those Country-Mi-

nisters

nisters did not use the Liturgy of the Church of England?

Let us next consider his Second Reason. King Edward's Liturgy appoints Lessons to be read out of the *Apocrypha* on some Festival-Days, how then could the *Ordinance* mean the *English* Liturgy, when it restricted the reading of the Lessons to the *Old* and *New Testament*? If he can prove, that the *Ordinance* restricts the Lessons to the *Old* and *New Testament*, so as to exclude all Lessons out of the *Apocrypha*, his Reason will be of Force: But it is impossible to do it. I might tell him, that there is nothing read on *Sundays* out of the *Apocrypha*, and not above Three or Four Festivals at most have the First Lesson from thence; so that they might very innocently have neglected to name the *Apocrypha*: But the plain Account of the thing is this. It is well known, that both in ordinary Discourse, and in the printed Books of the *English* Divines, it is always said, that the Lessons of the Liturgy are taken from the *Old* and *New Testament*, without any Mention of the *Apocrypha*; yea, this is not only the Language of common Conversation and private Doctors, but even the Church and Liturgy it self use this Way of speaking: And to be convinced of this, let him be pleased to read, in the Book of Common Prayer, the Order how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read, which begins thus: "The *Old Testament* is appointed
 T "ning
 " for the First Lessons at Morning and Eve-

“ ning Prayer ; so as most Part thereof will be
 “ read every Year, once, as in the Kalendar
 “ appointed. The *New Testament* is appointed
 “ for the Second Lessons at Morning and Eve-
 “ ning Prayer, and shall be read over orderly
 “ every Year thrice, &c. ” Here there is not
 one Word of *Apocrypha*, as being comprehen-
 ded under the *Old Testament* according to the
 usual way of speaking. The Church of *Eng-
 land* has declared in their Sixth Canon, that
 some Lessons are appointed to be read out of
 the *Apocrypha*, not for proving any Points of
 Faith, but as being very instructive for Morals ;
 and yet she does not scruple to call them Lessons
 out of the *Old Testament*, in Imitation of the
 Ancient Fathers, who often cited, by the Name
 of the *Scripture*, those pious Writings of Apo-
 stolical Men, which were publickly read in
 their Congregations, and yet were not esteemed
 Canonical. The *Ordinance* therefore could not
 be better expressed, than in the very Language
 of the Liturgy, which it authorizes. It would
 be most ridiculous to reason thus: The Li-
 turgy for the *English* Church appoints Lessons
 only out of the *Old* and *New Testament* : There-
 fore no Lessons are appointed to be read out of
 the *Apocrypha*. Must it not then be as ridicu-
 lous to reason after this manner, The Book of
 Common Prayer in the *Ordinance* has no Les-
 sons except out of the *Old* and *New Testament* :
 Therefore it had none out of the *Apocrypha* ?

Perhaps he will have better Success with his Second Assertion. Secondly, " I affirm (saith he) That that Particular of the Lessons is no Demonstration, that it was not the *Genevan* Liturgy was meant in the Ordinance. For it is not to be doubted, that the First Copy of our *Scotch* Liturgy was that which we had from *Francfort*, and was exactly the same with the First. Now in the Admonition to the Reader, subjoined to the said Liturgy, the Compilers were aware, that their Enemies would object the Want of the reading or Lessons of the Epistles and Gospels to them. They resolved therefore to anticipate that Objection; but how? Do they acknowledge, that they wanted them? No; they confidently affirm, they had them in greater Perfection than others, and that upon this score, because they read the Scripture through in Order. Take their Words from the *Latin* Copy, *Lectionem Evangeliorum & Epistolarum Ecclesia non omisit, sed restituit. Illi potius omiserunt, qui sic truncatim legerunt--Jam hæc Ecclesia, & si quæ sint aliæ reformatæ Evangeliorum & Epistolarum, imo totius sacre Scripturæ libros omnes ordine prælegunt.* " Perhaps some may condemn me for making any Return to such Subterfuges and Trifling. Yet that the *Country-Man* may have no Reason to complain of being neglected, I shall bestow a few Words upon what he pretends. And First, there is no Ground imaginable to believe, that the *Ad-*

monition, subjoined to the *Latin* Translation of *Francfort*, was ever in any *English* Version of the *Genevan* Liturgy. It is no Part of the Liturgy, and if it was written by an *English* Man, was only added by those hot People to vindicate themselves from the *Odium*, that they had Reason to fear, their rash and factious Conduct wou'd bring upon them: There is nothing like it to be found in all the Copies of *France* and *Geneva*; and I challenge him to show it in any Edition whatsoever of the *English* Version. But, in the Second Place, Tho' it were not only in the *Francfort* Edition in *English*, but also in all the Copies that ever were printed afterwards, yet it does not in the least remove the Difficulty. For there is no Command or Order contained in that Admonition concerning the Lessons; they, by Accident, to obviate an Objection, mention the Reading the Scriptures in Order: And, as by the Words cited, they own, they read no *Gospels* or *Epistles* in the *Liturgic* Sense, that is, Parts of the *Gospels* and *Epistles* appropriated to particular *Sundays* and Holy Days; so they also acknowledge, they had no Lessons, that is, such particular Chapters out of the *Old* and *New Testament*, restricted to every Day of the Year. They tell us expressly, they read all the Books of the Scripture in Order; so that in an Age they could not expect to have the same Chapters read on the same Day of the Year. Whereas by the Ordinance it is appointed, that *Lessons*,
(by

(by which no Man ever, except the *Country-Man*, understood any other Thing than particular and determined Portions of Scripture) should be read on *Sundays* and Holy Days, conformable to the Book of Common Prayer. It is evident, that the Festivals were observed at that Time in *Scotland*; and plain Reason and the Nature of the Thing, requires such Places of Scripture should be read upon them, as were most adapted to the Mysteries and Mercies commemorated on those Days; and accordingly it was, and is the Custom of all Churches. There were indeed no proper *Lessons* for *Sundays* in the two Liturgies of *Edward VI.* the Table for them being added only under *Queen Elizabeth*, yet they had determined Lessons, to wit, those that were appointed in the Kalendar for the Days of the Month upon which they fell: But as to the other Holy Days, the most of them had even proper *Lessons* in *Edward's* Liturgies, as well as in these of *Queen Elizabeth*, *King James*, &c. Now the *Country-Man* dares not pretend, that there is any such Order even insinuated in the *Admonition*. Besides, we are not told there, in what Order the Scriptures are to be read, I mean, whether they were used to read two or three Chapters out of *Genesis*, and the next Day the following two or three, and so on; or if they were to read a Chapter or two out of the *Old*, and as many out of the *New Testament*, every Day; and yet that was necessary to have been told. The
most

most natural and obvious Sense of the Words, cited from the *Admonition* is, that, at *Francfort*, they began from the Beginning of *Genesis* and so read on ; and if it was so, then they could seldom or never have *Lessons* out of the *Old* and *New Testament* in one Day, which is directly opposite to the Order prescribed by the Book of Common Prayers in the *Ordinance* : So that his Citation will prove the quite contrary of what he designed by it.

What the *Country-Man* adds concerning another *Ordinance*, made *Anno 1555*, appointing the Brethren to *assemble at certain Times to Common Prayers, and to exercise in reading the Scriptures*, is of a Piece with the rest. He pretends, That the two *Ordinances* are like one another ; and therefore that it is natural to interpret the one by the other, to wit, that in *Anno 1557*, as being more obscure, by the *Ordinance Anno 1555*, as being more simple. I see no Obscurity in either of them, and they agree very well together ; and I cannot understand what he means by a *simple Proposition*. Sure I am, common Sense, without the Help of artificial Logic, may teach every Man, that an Action or Custom is more fully and clearly known by a particular and determined Description, than by a general and indefinite Account of it. As for Example, in the present Case, I understand very well, what our Reformers meant by *assembling together at certain Times* ; but still I am ignorant what these *certain Times* were : But

as soon as I cast my Eyes upon the other *Ordinance*, I am fully satisfied; for it tells me, they were *Sundays* and the other *Holy Days*, conformable to, *i. e.*, appointed by the Book of Common Prayer. And after the same manner I have no Difficulty to know, what they meant by *exercising themselves in reading the Scriptures*; but still I am left in the Dark, after what Manner, and in what Method the *Scriptures* are to be read, or how much upon every one of these certain Days: But the other *Ordinance* removes all my Doubts; it informs us, that the *Lessons* for each *Sunday* and *Holy Day*, were determined by the Book of Common Prayer. Seeing therefore this is clearly and distinctly done in the *English* Liturgy, and not so much as the least Vestige of it in the Order of *Geneva*, no not in the *Admonition* subjoined to the *Latin* Edition, I leave it to the impartial Reader to determine, whether the *Country-Man* had great Reason to boast, That the Argument taken from the *Lessons* was quite vanished.

The most ingenious Author of the *Charter* had said, "None of our Presbyterian Historians, neither *Petrie*, nor *Calderwood*, have the Confidence to pretend, nay to insinuate the Possibility of its being the common Order of *Geneva*, that is meant in the *Ordinance*, which it is very probable, they would have done, if they had had the smallest Hopes of making it feasible." The *Country-Man* thinks the Argument may be retorted by putting *Episcopal*

copal Historians, instead of *Presbyterian*. But I must beg his Pardon to tell him, There is a vast Difference. Sure I am, no candid Person will deny, but the Book of *Common Prayer* in the *Ordinance* seems to be nothing but the *English Liturgy*. Was it not therefore their Duty and Interest to have guarded against any Mistake, if it could have been done by any Means? And in Effect we see *Calderwood* did all that was possible in the present Case: For tho' he had not the Confidence to deny expressly, that it was the *English* Book of *Common Prayer*; yet he gives only a superficial Account of the Matter, and quite omits the Mention of other *Holy Days* besides *Sunday*, which very much weakens the Strength of the Argument. But on the other Hand *Spotswood*, seeing the Thing clear and evident of it self, by the bare Narration, had no Use for any Explication, or raising a Scruple where there was none. He, with the other Bishops who compiled the *Scotish Liturgy*, in *Charles I's* Time, affirms plainly in the *Preface* to it, *That it was, then, known, that diverse Years after the Reformation, we had no other Order of Common Prayer but the English Liturgy*. Here when there was Use for it, Arch-Bishop *Spotswood* asserts the Thing confidently; and not only so, but even that *it was known at that Time*. But to this Testimony of our Bishop, the *Country-Man*, P. 77. answers, *That it is amicum testimonium, and so much the less to be credited*. Any who considers all Circumstances will think this Testimony

simony of very great Weight. It cannot be denied, but *Spotswood* understood the History of the *Church* exactly: Can it be thought then, that so pious and wise a Prelate would have so confidently affirmed a notorious Falshood; and not only so, but pretended, That it was even *then* known to be a Truth? Far less would he have suffered it to be put before the *Liturgy*, which he knew was an Eye-sore to all the Factious and Discontented, who would be glad of so just an Occasion of running down both it and its Authors. And I do not remember, that it was contradicted or denied by their very Enemies. And *Calderwood* himself is so far from saying, the Book of Common Prayer in the *Ordinance* was the *Genevan*, that on the contrary he seems fairly to acknowledge, it was the *English* Liturgy; but at such a Distance from the Year 1557, that, no Doubt, he thought himself pretty secure, that few Readers would reflect upon it as an *Acknowledgment*. For he tells us, *That the Masters of the New College of St. Andrew's, Anno 1623, used the English Liturgy in their College, notwithstanding they wanted the Warrant of any General Assembly, or of any continued Practice of the Form in Time bypast since the Reformation.* Where the Weight of the Argument against the Liturgy is laid on its not having had a *continued Practice* since the Reformation; which is a clear Concession, that at the *Reformation*, it was in Practice, tho' that Practice was not continued. The *Country-Man* in An-

swer to this, computes the *Reformation* from the Public Establishment of it ; and in the present Dispute, we mean, by the Time of the Reformation, that Time when first the Reformed in *Scotland*, began to have a separate and distinct Worship from those of the *Romish* Communion, which was long before 1560. And then he endeavours to expose the Reasoning by a Mock-Conference with one of his own Comrades, to whom he says, *Such a Business was never done since the Creation*. But, if he had been resolved to make an exact Parallel, he should have said, *Such a Thing had never such a continued Practice since the Creation* ; and then I think, his Comrade might have very justly inferred, that the *Country-Man* insinuated, It had a Practice, tho' no *continued Practice*, since the *Creation*. But he adds, *Calderwood* meant only that Practice of King *James VI.* who *Anno 1617* visited his ancient Kingdom, and brought the *English* Service along with him, and kept it wherever he came. If one were as much inclined to dispute as the *Country-Man* seems to be, he might say, That this does not serve him or *Calderwood* ; for it is certain, The Ambassadors of Princes were allowed to worship G O D in their own Chapels according to the Religion and Rites of their Countries ; if then the King, who was King of *England*, choosed to worship G O D according to the Rites of that Church, for a very small Time, that can never be interpreted as a Violation or Interruption of the Order of the *Scottish*

tish Church. But I hate all Wrangling, and therefore I let it pass. He might have remembered, that our Author had said, It is no Matter, whether *Calderwood* acknowledged this or not; seeing we have sufficient Evidence for the Point in Hand, without it.

And it is a strong enough Argument, which the *Country-Man* endeavours to Answer in the next Place. *viz.* The Ordinance is, That the Book of Common-Prayers should be used in all Churches from that very Date. But we find, by the First Book of Discipline, that the Order of *Geneva* was only coming in to be used then in some of our Churches. To this he replies by denying that it is said, from one End of the Book to the other, That it was only *then* coming in: But he acknowledges it says, *The Order of Geneva was then used in some of our Churches*: If then only in *some*, it follows necessarily that it was not in *all*, and consequently was but coming in. He has not thought fit to repeat his unaccountable Evasion, which I have sufficiently exposed before, and therefore I proceed.

Our Author had asserted, That the *Genevan* Liturgy had nothing like a Public Establishment till the General Assembly, *December 25, 1562.* and the *Country-Man* says, "He had shewed the notorious Falshood of this before; because he had proved, That the First Book of Discipline was Law-Ecclesiastical." I have already examined his Proofs; and there-

fore, I will not trouble the Reader any further upon that Head.

I am obliged to follow the *Country-Man's* Method, who, as he thinks fit, inverts the Order of our Author's Reasonings, and gives us only such Shreds of them as he pleases; and therefore I would once for all beseech the candid Reader, diligently to compare what our Author has most judiciously said concerning the Public Deeds of our Reformers, with the lame and imperfect Representation his Adversary has given of them; for my designed Brevity will not suffer me to repeat more of that which has been set in the clearest Light, by the incomparable Author, than is absolutely necessary. The next Public Deed of our Reformers, mentioned by the *Country-Man*, is that Letter of the Lords of the Congregation to Secretary Cecil, Anno 1559. by which they begged Assistance from *England*, because it was of the same Religion, as *Knox* expresses it, against the Q. Regent and the *French*. The Secretary sent them Word, That *their Interprize misliked not the English Council*, and immediately the Lords returned an Answer not in the present Presbyterian Strain, but as those who looked upon the Church of *England* as a true Christian Church, and her Communion as lawful and commendable. " They call *Cecil* an unfeigned
 " Favourer of Christ's true Religion: They
 " desire no earthly Thing more than the
 " Assurance of a perpetual Unity betwixt
 " the

“ the two Realms, to the Praise of GOD’s
 “ Name and the Comfort of the Faithful in
 “ both Realms. They promise to leave a Charge
 “ and Command to their Posterity, that the
 “ Amity between the Nations (in GOD)
 “ contracted and begun, may be by them kept
 “ inviolable for ever. They say, Their Con-
 “ federacy, Amity and League shall not be like
 “ the Pactions made by worldly Men, for
 “ worldly Profit; but as they require it, for
 “ GOD’s Cause, so they will call upon His
 “ Name for the Observation: And afterwards
 “ they call it a Godly Conjunction.” Secretary
Maitland was sent, *November 1559*, to treat with
Queen Elizabeth; who managed the Matter so,
 and brought it to such Maturity, that im-
 mediately upon his Return the League was
 finished: But none of our Historians tell us,
 what Commission he had, or what Instru-
 ctions, how he managed his Business, or
 upon what Terms the Queen of *England* and
 he came to an Agreement; and therefore the
 ingenious Author of the Charter reasons upon
 the common Principles of Prudence. “ What
 “ was more natural for the *English Council* to
 “ require, than that the *Scots* should engage
 “ to transcribe the *English* Copy, and establish
 “ their Reformation upon the same Foot, *i. e.*
 “ receive the Doctrine, Worship, Rites and
 “ Government of the Church of *England*? ----
 “ The Point in Agitation was a Confederacy
 “ in Opposition to Popery, and for the Security
 “ of

“ of the Reformed Religion in both Kingdoms.
 “ It was obvious therefore to foresee, that it
 “ would be the stronger, and every Way the
 “ better suited to that great End, if both
 “ Churches stood on one Bottom ; for diffe-
 “ rent Constitutions are apt to be attended
 “ with different Customs, which may intro-
 “ duce different Sentiments and Inclinations ;
 “ and the smallest Differences are apt to cre-
 “ ate Jealousies, Divisions, and cross Interests.
 “ Queen *Elizabeth* was peculiarly concerned to
 “ crave this. ---- She was afraid of the Queen
 “ of *Scot*’s Pretensions to the Crown of *Eng-*
 “ *land* ; for this Cause she was confederating
 “ with the Queen of *Scotland*’s Subjects, that
 “ she might have them on her Side. ---- What
 “ was more natural then, than that she should
 “ demand, That they should be of the same
 “ Religion, and their Church of the same
 “ Constitution, with the Church of *England* ?”
 The *Country-Man* asks, *If there be any Historian*
who says, That Queen Elizabeth did demand this ?
 To which I answer in our Author’s own Words.
 “ This Politic was so obvious, that it is not to
 “ be imagined, she and her wise Council did
 “ overlook it ; and tho’ it had been no where
 “ upon Record, that she craved it, yet the
 “ common Sense of Mankind would stand for
 “ its Credibility. What shall we say then, if
 “ we find it recorded by an *Historian*, whose
 “ Honesty is not to be questioned in this Mat-
 “ ter ? And such an one we have, even
 “ *Bucha-*

“ Buchanan himself, tho’ he misplaces it, and
 “ narrates it a long Time after it was done,
 “ and as it were only by the by. ” In the
 next Place, the *Country-Man* renews the Argu-
 ment against himself in these Words: *If it*
was Queen Elizabeth’s Interest, there is no doubt
it was her Demand: For never crowned Head of
either Sex pursued their Interest more closely than
she. To which he replies, *That this is as plau-*
sible as any Thing can be. But he will prove, that
 it was not her Interest, from our own Author,
 who P. 237. states this Enquiry to himself:
Whether it is not probable, that Queen Elizabeth
was willing, the Presbyterian Humour should be
encouraged in Scotland? And he determines
 in the *Affirmative.* But if there was any Con-
 tradiction here, the *Country-Man* might have
 found it nearer, even in that Sentence: *Queen*
Elizabeth was afraid of the Queen of Scotland’s
Preensions to the Crown of England; for this Cause,
she was confederating with the Queen of Scot-
land’s Subjects, that she might have them on her
Side. The plain Meaning of which is,
 she was willing to encourage the Presbyterian
 Humour of rebelling against their Sovereign,
 of entring into Treaties and Leagues, not on-
 ly without her Consent and Approbation, but
 directly contrary to her Interest and Authority.
Queen Elizabeth had Reason to think, that
 the League betwixt herself and the Subjects
 of our *Queen*, or betwixt *England* and *Scotland*,
 would be more firm and lasting, if the Reformed

med Church in *Scotland* were founded on the same Bottom with that of *England*, and agreed exactly with her in Doctrine, Worship and Government. And yet, after the *Scots* were freed from the *French*, and instead of adhering to the Articles of Religion stipulated and agreed to, they began to go farther from them than *Geneva* it self; what Wonder was it, that she, underhand, encouraged their Factions and Divisions, so to weaken them, lest they should unite in the Interest of their lawful Sovereign, and assert her Title by Force of Arms? This has been a constant Politic of Princes, and is plain from innumerable Instances. We have heard that a *Pope* and *Emperor*, who would have thought it highly their Interest to convert all the World to the *Romish* Faith, did notwithstanding enter into a Confederacy for dethroning a Prince of their own *Communion*. There is not the least Shadow of Contradiction here. And I leave it to the Candid to judge, whether our Author deserved to be treated with so indecent Language, as cannot be excused in the very rudest of real and meer Country-Men.

What he adds concerning *Lethington*, shall be examined in its due Place. Nothing hinders me now from considering the famous Testimony of *Buchanan*, brought by our Author to prove, That the *Scots* subscribed to the Religious Worship and Rites of the Church of *England*. The Occasion of which was this:
 When

When Anno 1569, the Earl of Murray, being then in the North, had got Accounts of the Duke of Norfolk's Conspiracy, his Friends pressed him to retreat in Time and leave the opposite Party. When Buchanan comes to give the History of this Juncture, he, to find a just Rise to his Narration, returns several Years backward, discoursing thus. *The State of English Affairs obliges me to look back a little; because in these Times, the Interests of both Kingdoms were so twisted, that the Concerns of the one cannot be represented without the other. The Scots some Years before, being delivered from the Slavery of the French by the English Assistance, had subscribed to the Religious Worship and Rites of the Church of England; and that surprising Change in Affairs seemed to promise to Britain Quietness and Rest from all intestine Comotions and Factions* *. Here the Thing is plainly affirmed. But the Country-Man asks, When and where they did subscribe? I answer, we are not obliged to satisfy him in that: For as in Philosophy we can demonstrate many Things, and know the Truth of some of them by infallible Experience, and the Testimony of our

X

Senses;

* Status rerum Anglicarum, hic, nos paulum divertere cogit, quod eo tempore, adeo utriusque regni prospera & adversa conjuncta erant, ut altera sine alteris explicari nequirent. Scoti ante aliquot annos, Anglorum auxiliis, e servitute Gallica liberati Religionis cultui & ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripserunt: ea subita rerum mutatio spondere videbatur Britanniam universam ab omni domestico tumultu conquieturam. E continenti vero, &c. Buchan. 714.

Senses ; and yet none has been able to give a satisfactory Account or Explication of the *Phænomena*, far less to answer all the Difficulties, that have been urged against them. And as in Matters of Faith, it is sufficient that we have Divine Authority for them ; even so in Matters of Fact, which depend upon human Testimony, it is sufficient we have such Authority as ought not to be suspected : And the present Case is such. *Buchanan*, their own beloved *Buchanan*, expressly affirms it, and all the Reason in the World obliges us to think it could not be otherwise. The Negligence and Silence of other Historians can never weigh down the Ballance. How many Things do we now know certainly, about which our old Historians were wholly silent ? Are we not certainly assured of the Truth of many most important Pieces of History, the contrary of which has been related by most or all of our Historians, as particularly the *Marriages of Robert II* ? But, tho' we are not obliged to name the Place where, or the Time when, this Subscription to the Religion, Worship and Rites of the Church of *England* was made ; yet our ingenious *Author* has given Instances in Two Occasions, either of which may probably satisfy the Difficulty. Tho' what the *Country-Man* has objected against the First is very liable to Censure ; yet to avoid all unnecessary Trouble, I shall confine my self to the Second. And I affirm with our excellent Author, That the most

ra-

rational and natural Account is, That Secretary *Maitland* and Sir *Robert Melvil*, who were sent by the *Scotish* Lords, in the Beginning of *November* 1559, to implore the Queen of *England's* Assistance, were impowered to agree, in Name of the whole Body, to this Union of Religion, if it should be demanded. It is certain from one of the Instructions to the *Commissioners* for concluding the Treaty at *Berwick*, *February* 10, 1559, that some Articles had been signed and agreed to by Secretary *Lethington* in *England*; tho' we are no where told, what they were. The *Country-Man*, Page 81, tells us, " They " were the same Articles which were confir- " med by the *Commissioners* at *Berwick*, and " signed and sealed afterward at *Leith*, *May* 10, " 1560: And that there is not the least Inti- " mation in that Treaty which is recorded by " *Knox*, P. 233, either that the *Scots* had sub- " scribed or agreed to, or that the *English* de- " sired them to subscribe, or agree to any the " least Article, either concerning Religion in " general, or the Worship and Ceremonies of " Religion in particular. " I confess indeed there is none of the *Public Articles* that have any Reference to Religion; and this makes it highly probable, yea necessary, that there should have been private Articles concerning it. The League was chiefly sought for and entred into, upon the Account of Religion, The Confederacy was not like the Pactions of worldly Men, but for the Cause of God, and it required Secresy, and was

to be communicated only to the Favourers of such a Godly Conjunction. Both the Nature of the Thing, and the Testimony of *Buchanan* oblige us to believe, that Secretary *Maitland* signed a private Article, concerning Religion and Worship, which was afterwards confirmed at *Berwick*, and at last fully agreed to, and signed (tho' in a separate Article) by the *Lords* themselves at *Leith*, 1560. And this removes all Difficulties, and even agrees with the Chronology of *Buchanan*. The Country-Man objects, That the Subscription was Three Quarters of a Year before: And our Author, foreseeing this Difficulty, humbly offered it to be considered, " Whether it was not possible, that *Buchanan* " intended not to lay any such Stress upon the " Word, *liberati*, as thereby to import, That " it was after the Accomplishment of our Deliverance, that the *Scots* subscribed; but " bringing in the whole Matter occasionally, " where he mentions it, and intending to dispatch it in as few Words as he could, he did " not stand nicely upon the wording of it. " And whoever considers the innumerable Blunders of that Author in his History, will make no Difficulty to believe it. Does he not often contradict himself? as particularly when he says (a) P. 117. That *Arthur's Oven* was *Templum Termini*; and yet he had said, P. 16. that it was not *Templum Termini*. It is certain none

(a) *Ultrajecti* 1668.

none of the Moderns was Master of a more elegant Stile, nor understood the Purity of the *Latin* Language, better than *Buchanan*; yet if his History came from his Hands, as we have it in all the Editions hitherto published, it will be an evident Proof, that he was doting when he wrote it. But whatever be in this, if the Subscription was made not only by *Lethington* and the Commissioners at *Berwick*, but also by the Lords or their Commissioners at *Leith*, the Subscription answers exactly to *Buchanan's* Time, and with the greatest Propriety and Niceness he might have said, and did say, *Scoti, ante aliquot annos, Anglorum auxiliis, e servitute Gallica liberati, Religionis cultui & ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripserunt.*

“ But (says the Country-Man) the uncontro-
 “ verted History of the Times, will not allow
 “ us to believe any such Thing. Plainly, they
 “ are not only silent of, but expressly contradict,
 “ and deliver what is utterly inconsistent with
 “ such a Transaction. ” Which he endeavours
 to prove, First, by asking, *If it be credible,*
that no Historian but Buchanan alone, should have
transmitted the Memory of such a Transaction;
no not even Spotswood himself, not Burnet,
not Heylen, not Fuller, tho' they had all an
Interest to serve, as well as a Story to tell?
 I have told him already, That it is not sufficient
 Proof, that a thing was not, because the Hi-
 storians are silent about it, no not suppose they
 should all contradict it. How many Things
 have

have been found to be false, which have been asserted by all our Historians? Whoever shall look into *Fædera Angliæ*, will easily be convinced of this: And beside the Omissions and real Faults, both of our own and the *English* Historians, which have been already supplied and corrected from authentic Charters and other Documents; we shall shortly see many others in the Second Volume of the *Scotish Heroes*, which is impatiently expected from the most learned and ingenious Author. And I doubt not but we may get from the *Fædera Angliæ* a clearer View of the Affairs of these Times, we are now discoursing of, than we have had hitherto from all the Historians *Scotish* or *English*.

But Secondly, he says, *King Charles I.* in his large Declaration, gives an Account of the Inducements he had to believe, that the Liturgy sent down, Anno 1637, would meet with a kind Reception; but he has not a Word that the *English Liturgy* had been subscribed to by the *Scots Nation*. But it is plain from the very Reasons the Country-Man sets down out of the Declaration, that the King's Design was to show he had reason to think, from the Practice of the *Scots* at that Time, that they would easily have complied with the Liturgy: And therefore it cannot be wondred at, that he did not mention this Transaction or any other that concerned only their Progenitors. "Many of these of the best Quality, had been used with the *English Liturgy*,
" both

“ both at *London* and upon the Road to and
 “ from it. It had been frequented at his Cha-
 “ pel at *Holy-wood-house*, and in the Cathedral of
 “ *St. Andrew's*, and had been used by some of
 “ the *Bishops* in their Ordinations: And the
 “ *Scots* Liturgy being the same in Substance
 “ with that, he had thought no Body would
 “ take Exceptions at it. ” Now all these Rea-
 sons are taken from the Inclination and Practice
 of the People of those Times, and it would
 have been impertinent to have brought in the
 Practice of their Fore-fathers 77 Years before.
 I have heard of Men who differed as much
 from themselves, in a very few Days, as the
Scots, Anno 1637. did from their Ancestors
 Anno 1560.

He pretends in the 3d Place, That they have
 the fullest Evidence from the most Public Do-
 cuments that can be imagined, that the *Scots*
 neither did, nor can be reasonably suspected to
 have subscribed the *English* Liturgy, either
 immediately upon our Deliverance from the
French, or any Time after it. This he un-
 dertakes to prove by a plain Deduction of the
 History. “ We were delivered from the
 “ *French* (saith he) by the Treaty at *Leith*,
 “ July 8th, 1560: And we find, from the last
 “ Article of that Treaty, that the Commissio-
 “ ners would not touch the Articles concer-
 “ ning Religion presented for the Part of the
 “ Nobility and People of *Scotland*, but referred
 “ them to their *Majesties*: And Sir *James Bal-*
 “ four,

“ *four*, in his *MS. Annals*, *ad An. 1560*, says,
 “ *In all these Articles they did not meddle with*
 “ *Religion for diverse Respects.* ” Hence in-
 deed it is evident enough, that there was no
 Public Article of that Treaty relating
 to Religion: But on the other Hand; it
 is as plain, that there were Articles concerning
 Religion presented on the Part of the Nobility
 and People of *Scotland*, which were referred
 to their Majesties; and who knows, but the
 Article, about Conformity to the Worship and
 Rites of the Church of *England*, was one of
 them? But whatever was of that, it is cer-
 tain, notwithstanding the Public Articles,
 subscribed by the Commissioners at *Leith*,
 there might have been Articles, subscribed by
 the *Scots* and *English* Commissioners privately,
 agreeable to their League, and *that*, amongst
 the rest, concerning the *Liturgy and Ceremonies*
of the Church of England.

Tho' I am not all obliged to follow him in
 the rest of his History, yet I shall neverthe-
 less accompany him with some few short Re-
 marks. He proceeds to prove, that the Sub-
 scription could not have been after the Treaty of
Leith, “ Because the Church drew up, and the
 “ Parliament ratified a *Confession of Faith*, which,
 “ in one Clause, subverts the whole Doctrine
 “ of uninstituted Ceremonies, *Declaring that*
 “ *evil Works are not only such as are expressly done*
 “ *against GOD's Commandment, but such also as*
 “ *in Matters of Religion and worshipping of GOD,*
 “ *have*

" have no other Assurance but the Invention and
 " Opinion of Man, which GOD from the Begin-
 " ning hath ever rejected " The Meaning of this
 is plainly no more, than that all Things obtru-
 ded as essential Parts of Worship and Religion,
 without Divine Authority, are to be condem-
 ned : And to extend it to indifferent Ceremonies
 and Circumstances, for the more decent and
 orderly Performance of Worship, were to make
 them condemn all the Churches of the World,
 since the Beginning of Christianity. The Coun-
 try-Man may learn from the *Admonition* subjoin-
 ed to *Liturgia sacra, seu Ritus Ministerii in Ec-*
clesia Peregrinorum Francofordiæ ad Mænum, &c.
An. 1554. that those at *Francfort* believed that
 the Church had Power to institute, continue, or
 reject Rites and Ceremonies in the Worship, as
 it thought most fit and expedient. *Nam in iis,*
quæ nullâ authoritate verbi Dei nituntur, credit
(Ecclesia) summam sibi datam auctoritatem tollen-
di vel retinendi. And again, *Commendat enim*
fidem, non violat Cæremoniarum externarum in
Ecclesiis varietas. And towards the End; *Ete-*
nim ut supra monuimus, in cæremoniis & re-
bus externis omnibus summa est Ecclesiæ libertas,
tantum omnia serviant ædificationi & ordini ac de-
coro. Now if that *Latin Liturgy* was a Tran-
 slation of an *English* one, which *Knox* and his
 Congregation made use of at *Francfort*, as the
 Country-Man pretends; then Mr. *Knox* could
 never condemn, in his *Confession of Faith*, all
 Rites and Ceremonies in the Worship, not
 Y ex

expresly enjoined in the Scripture. But altho' this be a very good Argument *ad hominem* (as they speak in the Schools) against the Country-Man; yet I shall beg Leave to inform the Reader, That as the *Admonition* is no Part of the Liturgy, so it is not of the same Authority with it: It was only added by the Translator, as is plain from his speaking of himself in the singular Number. *v. g. Hanc porro Liturgiam non omnibus probari haud equidem ignoro: And again, provide hortor & obsecro, &c.* Neither can I believe that the Translation of the Liturgy was made from an *English* one, but only from the *French*. Fuller tells us (a), That the *English* Exiles came first to *Francfort*, June 24, 1554, and got the Use of the *French* Church there by Turns with the *French* Protestants on the 14th of *July* following. *Knox* came not to *Francfort* before (b) *November*: And some Historians inform us, that *Knox* was the chief Contriver of the Liturgy used by the *English* Exiles there. It seems therefore most like to Truth, that this *Latin* Copy was rather done by some *French*-Man, and from the *French* Original. For the Preface bears Date *September* the First (*Kal. Sept.*) more than Two Months before *Knox's* coming, and they might justly enough call it *Peregrinorum Liturgia* (tho' they had meant by *Strangers*, not only the *French* themselves, but also the *English*) because the Use of the Church had been granted to the *English*, on this Condition, That

(a) B. 8. P. 27. (b) *Calderwood*, P. 3.

That they should not dissent from the *French* in Doctrine or Ceremony: But it looks on the other Hand very improbable, that the *English*, in Six Weeks Time, did not only compile a Liturgy in *English*, and got it printed; but also got the same translated into *Latin*, and printed also. But *Heylin* puts the Matter beyond all Doubt: For he tells us expressly (c), " In these Transactions some of the *Francfort* Schismatics desire, that all Divine Offices might be executed according to the Order of *Geneva*, which *Knox* by no Means would yield unto, thinking himself as able to make a Rule for his own Congregation as any *Calvin* of them all.----- But in the End, to give Content to such as remained affected to the former (*English*) Liturgy, it was agreed upon, that a mixt Form, consisting partly of the Form of *Geneva*, and partly of the Book of *England*, should be digested and received till the First of *April*." As to what the *Country-Man* adds concerning our Author's subscribing *Knox's Confession of Faith*, he may know, that our Author and the rest of the *Episcopal* Clergy swore to that *Confession*, only so far as it was agreeable to the Scriptures: For this was one of the Parts of that *Explication* of the *Test*, which was given them by the King and Privy-Council, who had undoubted Authority, according to our express Law, to explain Acts of Parliament.

2dly. He adds, " The Church agreed to, " and the Nobility subscribed the First Book " of Discipline. " And 3dly. For Worship and Administration of the Sacraments, the Book of Discipline, " ratified the common " Order of Geneva. " I have already shown, that the Book of Discipline was treated in ridicule, and called a Devout Imagination, and was neither Law Civil nor Ecclesiastical. Tho' it was declared by this Book, *That it appertaineth to the People, and to every several Congregation, to elect their Minister :* And tho' Patronages were condemned by the Second Book of Discipline, as contrary to the Word of G O D, yet they still obtained in Scotland until the rebellious Convocation in 1649. He adds, *That S. J. Balfour tells, The Nobility promote, this Year 1560, the Reformation according to that of Geneva established by Calvin. That Knox was very sanguine for the Order of Geneva, and that by his Influence, and for worldly Motives of Interest, some of the Nobility began to be inclined that Way, cannot be denied. Yet it is certain from the Book of Discipline it self, that the Genevan Liturgy was only in some of their Churches. And the First Act of Assembly, establishing it, is in December 25, 1562, and that only as to the Sacraments, Marriage, and Burial of the Dead. And as if the Act had not been strong enough for turning out of the English Liturgy, the Assembly, December 1564 found themselves concerned to make another Act,*

Act, ordaining every Minister, &c. to use the Order of Geneva in Prayers, Marriage, and Administration of the Sacraments; where, Prayers, not mentioned in the former Act, are added. Neither needs it to be wondered at, that they changed their Conduct so soon: For the Country-Man himself tells us from Spotswood, That Queen Elizabeth was in Jealousy of the Scots, lest they should not stand to the Treaty of Leith, and complained of their Delays in ratifying the same, and this near a Year after the Commissioners being at London.

His last Argument is from the First Article of Perth, Anno 1618, where it is said, *Our Church had used since the Reformation of Religion, to celebrate the L O R D's Supper to the People sitting.* It is not to be doubted, but Knox, who had an early and violent Scruple against kneeling at the Sacrament, would use his utmost Efforts against the decent and devout Posture, and perhaps it was the First of the Rites which came to be altered, which might be done without omitting one Word of the Service; and therefore it might be said with Truth, that ever since the Reformation, that is, according to the more ordinary Acception of the Words, since the Public Establishment of it, kneeling was not used: But this makes as little against the Bishop's Testimony as all the rest.

We are at length happily brought to the Country-Man's last Effort, and that is, to try if Buchanan's Words are not fairly capable of some such Sense,

Sense, as may agree with all other History. And he affirms, " That there is no more
 " meant by *Buchanan's* Words but this fair Ge-
 " neral, That the *Scots*, after their Delivery
 " from the *French*, by the Assistance of the
 " *English*, by Act of Parliament, established
 " the Reformed Religion among themselves,
 " as the *English* had done the Year before. "

And he says, *This Sense of the Words is a Truth* ; and he adds, *That it is the only Truth that can be contained in his Words*. That it is a Truth no Body will deny : But that it is a Truth and the only Truth, that *Buchanan* intended to express, has not been shown, nor can be proved by the *Country-Man* and all his Party. He adds, *Thirdly* : " That this Sense agrees exactly with *Buchanan's* Stile in other Places, and with his Context in that Place. " This is indeed to the Purpose, and if he prove as well as he affirms, I, for my Part, will frankly yield *Buchanan's* Testimony to him. For the Proof of that, he thinks no more needful, but to show, that *Buchanan* usually expresses an Act or Deed of *Parliament* by the Verb *subscribo* ; and Religion in general, whether *Popish* or *Reformed*, as his Subject leads him, by the Words, *cultus, ritus, ceremonia*, and the like, without Reference to a *Liturgy* of any Kind. There is no Doubt, *subscribo*, by a Metaphor, may signify any Thing, that is equivalent to signing or subscribing among Men ; and therefore those, who consented to, and voted for an Act of Parliament, may be very well
 said

said *Ordinum decretis subscripsisse*. Neither is it to be doubted, but Religion in general may be very well expressed by *Cultus*: Yea, the particular Religion of a *Sect* or *Country* may be clearly enough signified by *Ritus* or *Ceremonia*; but never so as to signify the Religion, that is, a System or Number of Principles or Opinions, in Opposition to the Worship and the Way and Manner after which it is performed; or excluding the Rites, Ceremonies, and Circumstances that are used in it. When *Sueton* says of *Tiberius*, *Externas ceremonias, Egyptios, Judaicosque ritus compescuit*; the Meaning is, he discharged and restrained the Public Worship of the *Egyptians* and *Jews*, according to their own Rites and Ceremonies. This is evident from the following Words: *Coactis qui superstitione ea tenebantur religiosas vestes cum instrumento omni comburere*. *Ritus* and *Ceremonia* are put to signify Religion, by the same Figure that the Part is put for the Whole, and therefore can never exclude that which is properly signified by them. And this I shall confirm from the very Instances, that the *Country-Man* has cited from *Buchanan*. When it is said, that there was a Conspiracy of all *Europe* in *majorum ritibus & ceremoniis propugnandis*, would it not be ridiculous to interpret it so, as that there was a Conspiracy to defend and maintain the *Creeeds* only of that *Church*; but in the mean Time to suffer every Body to Worship G O D, by whatsoever Liturgy, Rites and Ceremonies they

they pleased? The *Country-Man's* Gloss is, That it was for supporting Popery in the gross, not an universal Liturgy. For, saith he, In Times of Popery every Country almost had its own, and England Four or Five, being canton'd to the several Uses of Sarum, York, Lincoln, Hereford and Bangor. But what, I pray, does he understand by Popery in the gross? I hope he will not deny, but the Order of Public Worship, the many Rites and Ceremonies observed in the *Romish* Church, are a Part and not a small Part of Popery. All the many Liturgies he talks of, are substantially the same; and if he will be pleased to compare the Books *in usum Sarum*, with the ordinary *Breviary*, *Missale* and *Rituale*, he shall soon be convinced of it: But tho' there had been the greatest Difference, yet every one of them was allowed and authorised by that Church. We do not infer, that the Scots subscribed to one single Liturgy, (for that the *Country-Man* must mean by an universal Liturgy) from *Buchanan's* Words abstractly and precisely taken, but as restricted by the Subject. If the Church of *England* had authorised two or more Liturgies; then our subscribing to the Religious Worship and Rites of *England*, would have obliged us to perform Divine Service by any one of these. But seeing the Queen and Parliament had established only one Liturgy, hence it is we infer, That the Scots subscribed to that one. Again, when *Buchanan* says of *Morton* and *Hume*, who took the Oath for the King,

King, That he should maintain the Religion received, *jurarunt eum doctrinam & ritus religionis, qui tum publice docebantur quoad posset servaturum.* The Meaning is, they swore, That the King should maintain the Kirk of Scotland in its Doctrine, Worship, Government and Discipline: And I refer it to the Brethren, if this be not a true Sense of a Coronation Oath. Gordon promised to reduce all the Northern Parts of Scotland *ad veteres ceremonias*; and again he renewed his Promises *de instaurandis ritibus Romanis.* The Country-Man says, Popery in general is meant in the First, and simply restoring of Popery in the last Place: But could Popery be restored without restoring the Mass, or the other Parts of the Worship, with the Rites and Ceremonies belonging to them? Spotswood tells us, " That the Queen Regent granted, that People should not be constrained against their Mind in Matters of Religion." Which in Buchanan's Style runs, *ut nemo cogeretur ceremoniis quas nolit uti.* Now the Sense of both is, that the Reformed should not be forced to go to Mass, or join in the Public Worship of the Romish Church contrary to their Consciences. *Pietatis adversus Deum cultus*, in the Regent's Character is Piety and Godliness: Many stood in Fear of their Life from the Cardinal *ob diversum Religionis cultum*; and the Cardinal knew, that many of the Nobility were alienated from him, *ob diversum pietatis cultum.* The Meaning of which is, as the

Country-Man says, *because they differed in Religion from him* : But the Difference in Religion contains in it a Dissatisfaction with the Worship which the Cardinal used ; and for that Reason the Phrase is chiefly made use of. No Body ever affirmed, that *cultus religionis* signifies performing the Worship by a Liturgy : But when these Words are used to signify the Worship of GOD in a Church, and we are sure that That Church performs the Worship no otherwise, than by a Liturgy ; in that Case, they must infer the worshipping of GOD by that Liturgy. And thus I think, it may appear from the very Instances brought by our Author, that *Buchanan* never expressed by *cultus, ritus & caremonia*, Religion in general, as he calls it, that is to say, the bare *creden-da*, or the speculative Points of Religion, excluding the Form of Public Worship and Rites. But I must add, that tho' the intire Phrase, *religionis cultui & ritibus subscribere* had been used, and justly used by *Buchanan* to signify Consent to the Articles of Faith only, in other Places ; yet it could never have been used by him in that Sense. It will be owned by all that have any Knowledge of the *Latin* Tongue, that supposing *Buchanan* had had a Design to inform us, that the *Scots* did subscribe to the Worship and Rites of the Church of *England*, he could not have expressed it by more proper, significant, or clear Words, than those he makes use of. He is famous for
the

the Elegancy of his Stile, and that Stile cannot be elegant which is not clear and distinct : To express Things ambiguously and obscurely, is far from entring into the Character of a good Author. Can it be thought then, that *Buchanan* would have spoke so *equivocally* and unwarrily on so nice and important a Subject? *Polycrates*, and the other *Asiatic* Bishops, were excommunicated by Pope *Victor*, for observing *Easter* on the Fourteenth Day of the Moon; tho' they agreed with the *Romish* Church in all Matters of Faith; if, notwithstanding, I should say, *Religionis cultus & ritus communes erant Polycrati, ceterisque Asiaticis Episcopis cum Ecclesia Romana*, would not every Body laugh at me? One might as well say of the *Greeks*, who subscribed to the Council of *Florence*, *Religionis cultui & ritibus cum Ecclesia Romana communibus subscripserunt*, tho' it be most false; for no such Thing was required of them: And at this Day, the latinized *Greeks*, *Maronites*, and other Eastern Christians, perform their Worship in *Rome* it self, by their own *Liturgies*, and with their own *Rites* and *Ceremonies*. *Buchanan* knew very well the vast Difference betwixt the *English* Worship and Rites, and these of *Geneva*; and if he had been to express the Act of the *English* Parliament, establishing the Protestant Religion, I am sure he would never have expressed it by these Words, *Regni ordines religionis cultui & ritibus cum Genevensi Ecclesia*

communibus subscripserunt; and consequently, he could never have understood by them, in the famous Testimony, any other Thing, *than that the Scots subscribed to the Religious Worship and Rites of the Church of England.* The Country-Man pretends to give a Way of speaking, parallel to this of Buchanan's, in the Inscription of the Letter, December 1556, sent by the Church of Scotland to the Church of England, which runs thus: *The Superintendents, Ministers and Commissioners of the Church within the Realm of Scotland, to their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman Antichrist, and do profess with them the Lord Jesus in Sincerity.* If to renounce the Roman Antichrist, and profess with them the Lord Jesus in Sincerity, be the same with observing the Rites and Worship of the Church of England, then the two Ways of speaking are certainly parallel, and no otherways. However, this I gather from the Inscription, *That the Church of Scotland even at that Time owned the Church of England to be a true Church, and her Communion to be a lawful Communion.*

And so we come to consider the Context, which, the Country-Man fancies, requires the Sense, that he has given to the Words: " For
" instantly (*saith he*) after the above Passage
" Buchanan tells us, That upon the said Tran-
" saction, Pope Pius IV. presently took the
" Alarm, and with Might and Main stirred up
" France and Spain against Queen Elizabeth. "

And

And then he asks, *What was it startled his Holiness on this Occasion? Was the Church of Scotland ever the further from Rome, that she had subscribed to the English Liturgy?* Truly, in my Opinion, she was further from Rome, and if she had adhered to her Subscription, would have been in less Hazard of returning to her. Does not the *Country-Man* own, that *F. Paul* makes the Pope's Fear and Trouble to have proceeded from the *Scots* revolting from his Obedience, by establishing the Reformation, which the *English* Assistance had enabled them to do. Now was not the joining with *England* in Religion, Worship and Rites, a plain Demonstration of their *renouncing the Pope's Authority*, and embracing the *Reformation*? But besides, the Pope saw by Experience, how much the Protestant Interest was already weakned by their own Divisions and Contentions; and therefore he could not but be more vexed, that *Scotland* and *England* were thus so closely united in all the Parts of Religion, and saw there was no Hope of making a Tool of *Scotland* to give *Queen Elizabeth* Disturbance behind her Back, as *Buchanan* observes there. If the Reformation firmly united the Two Nations, then much more would this perfect Agreement in all Things, not only of Doctrine, but also Worship, make it the more strong and lasting; and consequently more terrible to the Pope. So that the true Sense of *Buchanan's* Words agrees with the Context much better, than that of the *Country-Man*.

Man. I am not at leisure to censure him for his unjust Insinuations here, which have been many times proved to be void of all Truth. Only I cannot altogether neglect, what he mentions concerning an Edition of the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery* under another Name. I can assure him, the Whole of that Matter is this: Tho' that Book met with kind Reception both in *Scotland* and *England*, yet the Bookseller having caused print a great Number of Copies, and a few remaining in his Custody not sold, he, without the Knowledge of the *Author* or his *Friends*, caused print a New Title-Page with that new Title, *Presbytery untwisted to the Bottom*, &c. So that it seems not very becoming a Christian to accuse so great a Number of Men, as using unconfessionable Methods, and that for a Thing, of which they were as innocent as the *Country-Man* himself. It is now high Time to conclude; and therefore I refer it to the candid Reader to determine, whether the *Country-Man* has not reckoned before his Host, or if he had Reason to hope, that he had by his Performance put an End for ever to that Argument for the Reception of the *English Liturgy* in *Scotland*, taken from our *Reformers Approbation or Usage* of it.

If the *Country-Man* thinks fit to make a Reply, and bring any thing new, that deserves to be considered, I shall not decline to give my Thoughts about it: But if instead of that, I meet with nothing but Evasions, Scoffs and Reproaches; as I have taken all possible Care,
that

that his Darts shall be thrown in the Dark, and he consequently miss his Mark; so nothing of that Nature shall ever oblige me to give him any other Return, than my hearty Prayers for his Repentance and Pardon.

ERRATA.

PAGE 9. Line 5. *read*, and his. P. 10. L. 15. *r.* not willing. P. 11. L. 7. *dele*, as. *Ibid.* Note, The Country-Man's Words begin, *I find.* *ib.* L. *penult*, *r.* unaccountable. P. 13. L. 14. *r.* Public. P. 16. L. 6. *r.* Communion-Book. P. 37. L. 20. *r.* is not. P. 61. L. 8. *r.* than. P. 95. L. 13. in the Foot-Note, *r.* P. 69. P. 103. L. 24. *r.* and this. P. 108. L. 1. *r.* to flee.

FINIS.

183

I shall be true in the dark, and
I shall be true in the light; to nothing of
this world shall ever oblige me to give him
any other Return, than my hearty Prayers for
his Repentance and Pardon.

ERRATA.

AGE of the ... and ... P. 10.
I ... not willing ... P. 11. l. 7. &c.
as ... Note: The County-Mans
Words begin, I ... is ... & unaccount-
able ... P. 13. l. 14. & Public ... P. 16. l. 6. &c.
Communion Book ... P. 37. l. 20. &c. is not
... P. 61. l. 8. & ... P. 62. l. 13. in the Foot-
Note ... P. 103. l. 24. & and this P.
108. l. 1. & 10. &c.

183

99089009



